

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

Nº XLI. OCTOBER 1885.

ART. I.—THE GLORIA IN EXCELSIS.

1. *An Account of the Greek Church, as to its Doctrine and Rites of Worship; to which is added an Account of the State of the Greek Church under Cyrillus Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, with a Relation of his Sufferings and Death.* By THOMAS SMITH, B.D. (London, 1680.)
2. *Miscellanea.* By THOMAS SMITH, B.D. (London, 1686.)
3. *Rerum Liturgicarum Libri Duo.* Auctore JOANNE BONA, studio et labore D. ROBERTI SALA. (Augustæ Taurinorum, 1747.)
4. *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, ed. HERM. ADALBERT DANIEL. (Lipsiæ, 1855.)
5. *Notitia Eucharistica.* A Commentary, Explanatory, Doctrinal, and Historical, on the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, according to the Use of the Church of England. By W. E. SCUDAMORE, M.A. (London, 1872.)

IN a paper which appeared in this Review some months ago an endeavour was made to trace out the early history of the *Te Deum*,¹ and to lay before our readers all that is really known of its composition and origin. In the present paper we propose to undertake a similar inquiry into the origin and early history of the *Gloria in Excelsis*. In the case of the *Te Deum* we saw grounds for doubting whether it was correct to seek for its sources on Eastern grounds. With the *Gloria in Excelsis* the case is widely different. Here there is no room for hesitation. It is without a shadow of doubt to the Greek Church that we owe this glorious hymn. The *Te Deum* is at the

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xviii., April 1884.

present day unknown in the East. The *Gloria* still forms, as it did in the fourth century, the usual morning hymn. Before, therefore, we endeavour to trace its history in the West it will be well to devote a few pages to its use and early history in the East.

The earliest known MS. which contains it is the priceless Codex Alexandrinus of the Bible, now in the British Museum. There it stands, together with the Scripture canticles, after the Psalms. It is entitled ὕμνος ἑωθινός, and is followed immediately by some verses or antiphons, mainly taken from the Psalms, as it is in all Greek MSS. of the hymn and in the printed editions of the Horologion. To these verses we propose to return later on; for the present we will confine our attention to the hymn itself. Besides Codex A it is found in another extremely ancient Psalter, viz. the 'Zürich Psalter,' assigned to the seventh century,¹ the title being the same as in the previously mentioned MS. These two MSS. we will call A and B respectively. Later Psalters as a general rule do not contain the hymn. There are, for instance, in the British Museum at least a dozen Greek Psalters, of various dates, ranging from the eleventh century onwards; and though most, if not all, of these contain the 'Odes,' i.e. the nine Scripture canticles said at Lauds, the *Gloria* is not found in a single one of them. So too there are several Psalters in the Bodleian Library in which it is wanting, although we have found three there which contain it—viz. Misc. Græc. 5, a 4to. of the ninth or tenth century;² Misc. Græc. 2, of the tenth, and Barocc. 15, of the twelfth. These we will term C, D, E. There is also (F) a Psalter in the library of Trinity College, Oxford (No. 78), assigned to the twelfth century, which contains it; and one (G), of the thirteenth century, at C.C.C., Cambridge (No. 480), to which a special interest attaches, as it once belonged to Bishop Grosseteste. The Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris is not specially rich in Greek Psalters, but we have examined the following there, which contain the *Gloria*: Nos. 22 and 40, of the eleventh century (H, J); 41, of the twelfth (K); and Suppl. Gr. 610 and 343, of the eleventh and twelfth centuries respectively (L, M). In all of these the title is as in Codex A, ὕμνος ἑωθινός, except in L, where it is ὕμνος καὶ εὐχαριστία, and M, in which the title is altogether wanting. And as a morning hymn it is used by the Greek Church at the present day. Smith, whose researches into the

¹ Edited by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta Sacra Inedita*, vol. iv.

² In this MS. it is followed by the ὕμνος ἑσπερινός, i.e. φῶς ἁπλόν κ.τ.λ.

history of the hymn have not been superseded by those of any later writer, says—

‘That excellent hymn, which our Church retains in her Communion Service . . . makes up a necessary part of their morning devotion upon Sundays and the other more solemn festivals ; and, indeed, as it appears by their ἀκολουθία ὕμνων, or office used every morning, on all other days, only with this difference, that it is then barely read and not sung, which is their present practice, as I found particularly on enquiry ; as also ἐν τοῖς ἀποδείπνοις, or their solemn prayers after supper before they go to their rest. This is called by them ἡ μεγάλη δοξολογία, or the Great Doxology, to distinguish it from the other, which they call ἡ δοξολογία μικρά, or the Lesser—that is, the *Gloria Patri*.’

Accordingly we find the hymn, as might be expected, in the Horologion, both in the ἀκολουθία τοῦ ὕμνων and in the ἀποδείπνον. But the text as given in modern editions varies in some points from that of the MSS., as will be seen from the apparatus criticus given below.

The text itself is arranged and punctuated as in the latest edition of the Horologion (Venice, 1884).² The MSS. from which variations are given are those enumerated above, together with the following early copies of the Horologion which we have collated :—

- N, British Museum, Addl. 31214 of the 12th century.
O, " " " 22507 of the 14th century.
P, " " Harl. 5541 of the 14th century.
Q, Brussels, 11332 of the 16th century.
R, Paris, 12, a Psalter and Horologion of the 15th century.

1. Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία.
2. Ὑμνοῦμέν σε, εὐλογοῦμέν σε, προσκυνοῦμέν σε, δοξολογοῦμέν σε, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι διὰ τὴν μεγάλην σου δόξαν.
3. Κύριε Βασιλεῦ, ἐπουράνιε Θεέ, Πάτερ παντοκράτωρ. Κύριε Υἱὲ μονογενές, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.
4. Κύριε ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἁμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ αἴρων τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου.
5. Πρόσδεξαι τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν ὁ καθήμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς.
6. Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ μόνος Ἅγιος, σὺ εἶ ὁ μόνος Κύριος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ Πατρὸς. Ἀμήν.
2. αἰνοῦμεν (for ὑμνοῦμεν), ABKLM. αἰνοῦμεν + ὑμνοῦμεν, CJ. *Omit* εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, L.
3. παντοκράτωρ, HK. Θεὸς πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ, AB. Καὶ (after παντοκρ.), NO. μονογενή, ABCDFKL.

¹ Greek Church, p. 223.

² P. 69.

4. τὰς ἀμαρτίας (*first occurrence*), B. All the other MSS. have the singular at the first occurrence, as the printed text. 'Concordant vero omnes in sequente versiculo habentque pluraliter τὰς ἀμαρτίας' (Smith). *Omit ὁ αἰρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς*, J. *At the end of the clause AB add ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς*.

5. ἐκ δεξιῶν, EOP. *Omit καὶ* all MSS. except P. The modern texts insert it, 'nescio qua auctoritate freti,' says Smith. It is found, however, in P.

6. *After Κύριος P inserts σὺ εἶ μόνος ὑψιστος κύριος Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν εἰς κ.τ.λ. After Χριστὸς C adds σὺν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι and M (prima manu).*

The variations are not of any great importance. In the early-printed Horologia which we have examined the text appears in a somewhat unsettled condition. The earliest printed copy in which we have noticed the unnecessary καὶ in clause 5 is one of 1598. In that published at Florence in 1520 it is wanting, though this has the more recent ὑμνοῦμεν, whereas the edition of 1598 agrees with the oldest MSS. in reading αἰνοῦμεν. But these variations are comparatively trivial. The only really important question is, What is the reading in clause 1, εὐδοκία or εὐδοκίας? and there it will be seen that the Eastern MSS. are unanimous in reading the nominative. Smith indeed tells us (*Greek Church*, p. 295) that εὐδοκίας is found in Notker's Psalter in the Bodleian, in a 4to. Greek Psalter in the same library, and in a very ancient Trèves MS. at the end of the Latin translation of the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom published at Worms by Ambrose Pelargus Nid-danus, 4to., ann. 1541.¹ Of these Notker's Tropary (not Psalter) is a *Western* MS., and as such not to the point, belonging to a class of MSS. which will be considered later on. Smith's 'Oxford 4to.' can hardly be anything else than Misc. 5; but if so he is mistaken as to its reading, and it most certainly has εὐδοκία. Of the third MS. we have been unable to find any trace. Nothing whatever is known of it

¹ This edition of the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom is not mentioned by Dr. Swainson in his *Greek Liturgies*. It is apparently a very scarce book, as there is no copy of it in the British Museum, the Bodleian, or the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. The Mazarine Library, however, possesses a copy, and bound up in the same volume is another interesting work, which has also escaped Dr. Swainson's notice—viz. *Missa D. Ioannis Chrysostomi a Leone Tusco jam olim conversa . . . Eadem recentius ab Erasmo Roterodamo translata . . . Colmarie MDXL*. The translation by Erasmus is nowhere alluded to by Dr. Swainson, nor does he refer to any edition of that of Leo Tuscus earlier than Morel's in 1560. We cannot help suspecting that one of these Latin translations is the true source whence Cranmer drew the 'Prayer of S. Chrysostom' which he placed at the end of the Litany in 1544.

at Trèves at present, and, since Pelargus speaks in the preface of the great difficulty which he experienced in deciphering the MS., partly owing to his imperfect knowledge of Greek, and partly in consequence of the abbreviations and illegible character of the document itself, it is impossible to appeal to its reading with any degree of confidence.

So much for the version of the hymn which has obtained in the Eastern Church. The question next arises, Is this, as represented by the oldest MSS., its original form? It differs, of course, in several points from the version with which we are all familiar, but no one would think of claiming that the Latin version was nearer to the original form than the Greek. It is quite clear, for instance, that the reference to the Holy Spirit has been transferred by the Latin translator from its original position to one which seemed more natural and suitable. In one respect we are gainers by the change. In the Greek text the words *καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα* certainly stand very awkwardly in the midst of the ascription of praise to God the Son. But in another respect we are losers, as the insertion of the words 'Tu solus altissimus cum Sancto Spiritu' in the Latin text completely hides the fact that the last clause of the hymn is a direct quotation from Philippians ii. 11. *Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ Πατρὸς*. This is of itself sufficient proof (if proof were needed) that the Greek is more original than the Latin. But the real reason for hesitation lies in the fact that another Greek version of the hymn has been preserved, differing considerably from that which is now current.

In the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, c. 48, in the edition of Cotelierius, we find the following:—

Προσευχὴ Ἑωθινή.

Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνῃ ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. Αἰνοῦμέν σε, ὑμνοῦμέν σε, εὐλογοῦμέν σε, δοξολογοῦμέν σε, προσκυνοῦμέν σε διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως, σε τὸν ὄντα θεὸν ἀγέννητον ἕνα, ἀπόσιτον μόνον· διὰ τὴν μεγάλην σου δόξαν. Κύριε βασιλεῦ ἐπουράνιε, θεὲ πάτερ παντοκράτορ Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἀμώμου ἁγίου, ὃς αἶρει τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου· πρόσδεξαι τὴν δέσπιν ἡμῶν ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν· ὅτι σὺ μόνος ἅγιος· σὺ μόνος κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ πάσης γεννητῆς φύσεως τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμῶν· δι' οὗ σοι δόξα τιμὴ καὶ σέβας.

It is difficult to know what to make of this. Bunsen, as is well known, endeavoured to reconstruct the original hymn by means of comparison of the three versions—viz. this in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the ordinary Greek text, and the received Latin.¹ The attempt is marked by his usual con-

¹ *Analecta Antenic.* iii. 86.

fidence in his own judgment, but can scarcely be considered a success.

With regard to the antiquity of this version, it must not be forgotten that the seventh and eighth books of the *Apostolic Constitutions* were added to the work at a comparatively late date. The Syriac MS. at Paris, the Arabic in the Bodleian, and the Ethiopic all agree in recognizing only six books. Further, none of the citations in Epiphanius are from the seventh or eighth books, which we may therefore suppose were added to the collection after his time. Quite recently a fresh light has been thrown upon the composition of the seventh book by the now famous publication of the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* by Archbishop Bryennios. From this we find that the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is an enlarged and expanded form of the *Διδαχὴ*, upon which it is entirely based as far as c. xxxii. But there is nothing whatever in the older work corresponding to the remainder of the book, which may, therefore, be unhesitatingly set down as an appendix. This appendix contains (1) a long prayer, c. xxxiii.-xxxviii.; (2) a description of the preparation of candidates for baptism and of the Baptismal Service, c. xxxix.-xlv.; (3) a list of the bishops supposed to have been appointed by the twelve apostles, c. xlv.; and (4) three hymns or canticles, including the *Gloria* and *Nunc Dimittis*. All these parts are very loosely strung together, and in its present form the book cannot be earlier than the latter half of the fourth century. The Creed which is given in the Baptismal Service bears unmistakable traces of the controversies of that century, and cannot be set down as earlier than A.D. 350, or thereabouts. Consequently there is no sort of reason to suppose that this version of the *Gloria* is older or more primitive than that which appears in Codex A, where it is found in less questionable company.

Again, is it even the true form of the hymn in the *Apostolic Constitutions*? On this point we cannot speak with certainty. Only four MSS. of the seventh book appear to be known at present. Of these (1) that at S. Petersburg (Lagarde's *w*) of the twelfth century is deficient throughout the hymn after the first word; (2) the Paris MS. of the sixteenth century (*z*) fails after *ἐπουράνιε*. The two Vienna MSS. (*x* and *y*), of the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries respectively, alone contain the whole hymn, and of these *y* agrees to a great extent with the standard text as given in the Greek Psalters.¹ The peculiar version therefore rests at present on the testi-

¹ See Lagarde's edition of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, p. 229.

mony of a single MS.¹ It must be taken for what it is worth, but it would be unreasonable to claim that it gave the original form of the hymn. Bunsen was perhaps right in thinking that neither version is an exact representation of it, but we strongly question whether the primitive form can ever now be restored. The shape of hymn as we know it was fixed in the fourth century. How much earlier it may be it is impossible to say. It is alluded to in the treatise *De Virginitate*, wrongly ascribed to S. Athanasius,² but the MSS. do not give the text in full. Still earlier some have imagined a possible allusion to it in the words of Hippolytus concerning the hymns appealed to against the heresy of Artemon—

Ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσαι, τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνοῦσι θεολογοῦντες—³

and in the famous expression of Pliny, which speaks of the Christians as 'carmen Christo quasi Deo canentes';⁴ while others have traced a knowledge of its language in the closing words of the prayer of the martyr Polycarp at the stake—

Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων αἰνῶ σε εὐλογῶ σε δοξάζω σε σὺν τῷ αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ ἀγαπητῷ σου παιδί. μεθ' οὗ σοι καὶ Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.⁵

The similarity is striking, but it is not sufficient to build upon. All we can say is that the hymn cannot be later than the fourth century, while it may well be two or three centuries earlier. In the midst of so much uncertainty as to its date it is useless to inquire who was its author.

Let us now turn to consider its history in the West. For so many centuries it has been associated with the Eucharistic office of the Church that it requires an effort of mind to realize that this was not its original use, but that here too, as in the East, it was at first simply a morning hymn. As such its use must once have been widely spread, as the evidence for it comes from very different quarters.

The rule of Cæsarius of Arles at the commencement of the sixth century gives it for use at mattins *omni Dominica*.⁶ That of Aurelian (died 545), the next bishop but one to Cæsarius, is to the same effect. It is to be sung at mattins

¹ The MSS. from which Turrianus published his edition, viz. one from Crete and two others from Calabria and Sicily, are at present unknown. It would, however, appear that they agreed with the peculiar version of *x*. The title *προσευχὴ ἑωθινή*, though found in *x* and *y*, is not given in *x*, nor yet in *w*.

² Migne, *Patr. Græc.* xxviii. 275.

³ Euseb. v. xxviii.

⁴ Pliny, *Epp.* x. xcvi. ⁵ *Patres Apost.* (ed. Jacobson), vol. ii. p. 599.

⁶ *Regula S. Cæsarii*.

not only *toto Pascha*, but also *omni die dominica et omnibus majoribus festivitibus*.¹

So the Mozarabic Breviary has it in the office for Sundays and festivals.

'Et nota quod in diebus dominicis et festivis debet semper dici Canticum *Te Deum laudamus*. Et Canticum *Gloria in excelsis*, et symbolum *Credimus in unum Deum*.'²

While in the ancient Ambrosian Breviary it stood after the Canticles *pro matutino quotidie*.³

Of its use at the same service (although on Sundays only) in Germany a single trace exists in the rubric prefixed to the hymn in a Lotharingian Psalter assigned to the ninth or tenth century, now in the British Museum (Galba, A xviii), *Hymnus in die dominica ad ms.* (i.e. matutinos).

In Ireland the Greek use was even more exactly followed, and it was used as an evening as well as a morning hymn (as it is at present in the East). In the very ancient MS. now at Milan, known as the Bangor Antiphony (C. 5, inf.), the rubric preceding the *Gloria* is as follows: *ad vesperū et ad matutinam*; while in the Irish *Book of Hymns* (Trin. Coll., Dublin, E. 4. 2), the time at which it is to be used is indicated by the turn given to the verses which follow, 'Dignare Domine nocte ista, &c.,' and another Irish MS. says definitely 'at night it is right to sing it.'⁴

With regard to the history of the use of the hymn in the Eucharistic service of the Western Church, it will be convenient to work back from the modern custom and endeavour to trace it to its first beginning. The directions in the Roman Missal as now used are as follows:—

'Gloria in excelsis dicitur quandocunque in Matutino dictus est Hymnus Te Deum, præterquam in Missa Feriæ quintæ in Cœna Domini et Sabbati Sancti, in quibus Gloria in excelsis dicitur quamvis in Officio non sit dictum Te Deum. In Missis Votivis non dicitur etiam tempore Paschali vel infra Octav. nisi in Missa B. Mariæ in Sabbato, et Angelorum, et nisi Missa Votiva solemniter dicenda sit pro re gravi, vel pro publica Ecclesiæ causa, dummodo non dicatur

¹ *Regula S. Aureliani*.

² *Brev. Goth.* Migne, vol. lxxxvi. p. 943.

³ It is found in the editions of 1490, 1508, 1539, 1557; but remarkably enough is *not* found in the *editio princeps* of 1475, a fact of which we are unable to offer any explanation.

⁴ The 'notes to the Felire of Aengus in the Leabhar Breac.' See Dr. J. H. Todd's edition of the *Liber Hymnorum*, p. 177. It is just possible that another indication of the use of the hymn in the daily office may be found in the account of the 'Cursus Scottorum,' printed in Haddon and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, vol. i. p. 139.

Missæ cum paramentis violaceis. Neque dicitur in Missæ Defunctorum.¹

These rules are certainly (in substance) more than a thousand years old, being frequently alluded to by the writers on ritual of the ninth and following centuries in the great collection of Hittorpius. We are also told by many of these writers that the introduction of the hymn into the Mass was attributed either to Symmachus (c. 500), or still earlier to Telesphorus (120). So Honorius of Autun² (twelfth century), Rupert of Deutz³ (d. 1135), Beruo Augiensis⁴ (d. 1048), Walafrid Strabo⁵ (d. 849), and Amalarius⁶ (ninth century). And the popular belief in the Middle Ages is conveniently summed up in the following extract from a MS. at Lambeth, containing some notes 'de Missæ' (Lambeth, 144):—

'Gloria in excelsis angelicus chorus in primis cecinit. Sanctus Hilarius Pictavensis Eps ab illo loco laudam' te usque ad finem apposuit. Telesphorus autem papa ad Missam cantari instituit. Symmachus vero papa in festis tantum illud cantari statuit' (fol. 33).

These statements concerning Telesphorus and Symmachus seem to rest ultimately on the *Liber Pontificalis*, the very words of which are frequently copied by later writers. In this we read, in the *Vita Telesphori*:—

'Telesphorus natione Græcus ex anchorita . . . Hic constituit . . . Natali Domini noctu Missæ celebrarentur cum omni tempore ante horæ tertie cursum nullus præsumeret Missam celebrare, quæ hora Dominus noster ascendit crucem, et ante sacrificium hymnus diceretur angelicus hoc est Gloria in excelsis Deo.'⁷

The *Vita Symmachi*, in the same work, has the following: 'Hic constituit ut omni die dominico vel natalitiis martyrorum hymnus diceretur angelicus id est Gloria in excelsis Deo.'⁸ What, then, is the value of these statements? The latter, we confess, we are disposed to rate very highly. Not only does it fit in with the fact that while the *Gloria in Excelsis* is recognized in the Gregorian Sacramentary⁹ and the ancient

¹ *Rubrica Generales.*

² Hittorp., col. 1205.

³ *Ibid.* 879.

⁴ *Ibid.* 699.

⁵ *Ibid.* 680.

⁶ *Ibid.* 372.

⁷ Migne, vol. cxxvii.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Muratori, *Lit. Vet.* vol. ii. p. 2. The rubric there given is as follows: 'Item dicitur Gloria in excelsis Deo si Episcopus fuerit tantummodo die Dominico sive diebus festis. A Presbyteris autem minime dicitur nisi solo in Pascha.' This direction is found in most early MSS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary, but not in all. It is wanting, for instance, in Paris Bibl. Nat. 9430, a Tours Sacramentary of the tenth century, which contains the introductory 'Incipit Liber Sacramentorum . . . per anni circulum,' but has no mention of the *Gloria*. The full rule is, however,

*Ordines Romani*¹ there is no trace of it in what remains of the Leonine and Gelasian Sacramentaries,² but further, if the latest theory with regard to the compilation of the *Liber Pontificalis* be true, it is really the evidence of a contemporary; for Duchesne's researches would seem to show that the work in question down to the death of Symmachus was compiled during the pontificate of Hormisdas (A.D. 514-523) by some converted Goth who had ardently espoused the side of Pope Symmachus. If this is correct, the *Liber Pontificalis* may fairly be regarded as a primary authority for the acts of Symmachus, and full credit may be given to its statement with regard to the introduction of the hymn in question into the Eucharistic service; while even if this theory of the composition of this work should not hold good, yet, as the words we are considering are also found in the Catalogue of Felix IV., written in the time of Justinian (*circa* 530), the value of the statement will be very slightly, if at all, diminished.

The information about Telesphorus stands on an entirely different footing, but it is possible that even here there may be a germ of truth. Probably the later writers who repeat the statements of the *Liber Pontificalis* have often misconceived their meaning. If we look closely at the words used we shall see that there is really no sort of necessity for understanding them to refer to anything more than the single verse from S. Luke ii. 14. And, while dismissing at once from consideration anything which would make Telesphorus responsible for the whole hymn, or even for the Latin translation of the first verse, we think it quite possible that he may have really been the first to introduce Luke ii. 14 into the Western Liturgy. For it should be noted that, though the whole hymn is unknown in the East in connexion with the Eucharist, yet this verse not unfrequently occupies an independent position in the ancient liturgies—*e.g.* it is found in the Liturgy of S. James after the Intercession,³ and in the same position in

given in the still earlier Tours Sacramentary in the Bodleian (Auct. D. i. 20). There is no notice of the hymn in Paris 9428, a Metz Sacramentary of the ninth century. (On the rule given above, cf. Berno Augiensis in Hittorp., col. 699.) The rubrics in the Codex S. Eligii of the ninth century, published by Menard, take notice of its use in several other places.

¹ Muratori, ii. 980, 1021.

² Except in the Baptismal Service on Easter Eve in the Gelasian Sacramentary, where we find the following rubric: 'Inde vero cum Letania ascendit ad sedem suam et dicit Gloria in excelsis Deo.'

³ Hammond, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, p. 36; Swainson's *Greek Liturgies*, p. 254. We also find from this volume that there is

the Syriac S. James.¹ In the (so called) Clementine Liturgy it occurs after the *τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἀγίοις*.² In the Coptic Liturgy it stands in the prayer of the Kiss of Peace,³ and in the Ethiopic in a somewhat similar position,⁴ while the Nestorian Liturgy of SS. Adæus and Maris commences with it.⁵

If therefore Telesphorus was the first to introduce it in a similar manner into the Liturgy of Rome, it is not improbable that some tradition of the fact would be preserved, which might well linger on until it was incorporated into the *Liber Pontificalis*, whence, as we have seen, it was copied and repeated with characteristic exaggeration by later writers. But, however this may be, we are inclined somewhat unhesitatingly to ascribe the first introduction of the hymn as a whole into the Communion Service to Pope Symmachus at the beginning of the sixth century. From Rome its use apparently spread until at length it was universally adopted in the West in the early part of the Ordinary of the Mass, while the older custom of singing it as a simple morning hymn gradually disappeared.

Of its use in the Gallican Church the facts of which we have knowledge are these:—1. There is no mention of it in the *Expositio Brevis*, assigned to S. Germanus in the sixth century. 2. Gregory of Tours, who alludes to the hymn in his writings more than once,⁶ gives no hint of any connexion of it with the Eucharist. 3. It is not found in any of the Gallican Sacramentaries still remaining, except the Bobbio MS. of the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, 'which belonged to some province in France that had adopted the Roman canon. The MS. was written in the seventh or early part of the eighth century. Now in this the *Gloria in Excelsis* appears not in its proper place, but appended to the canon as if for occasional and perhaps rare use, with the heading, "the *Gloria* to be sung at Mass."⁷ Hence we may fairly conclude that the *Gloria* as well as the canon was an importation from Rome.

In Spain (1) there is no mention of it in the Treatise of Isidore of Seville, *De Off. Eccl.*; and (2) it would appear probable, from the language used by the fathers at the fourth

some slight authority for reading the verse in the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, p. 109.

¹ Hammond, p. 60.

² *Ibid.* p. 21.

³ *Ibid.* p. 205.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 254.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 267.

⁶ Gregory of Tours, *De Mirac. S. Martini*, lib. ii. c. 25; *De Glor. Mart.* i. c. 63.

⁷ Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 693 (ed. 1).

Council of Toledo (A.D. 633),¹ that although the hymn was familiar to Spanish Churchmen, it was not as yet used in the Mass. But (3) a century and a half later (A.D. 783) we find Heterius and Beatus asserting that 'in the Mass, not only on the Lord's Days, but on all festivals whatsoever, do we together cry, "Glory to God in the highest!"'² The rubric, however, in the Mozarabic Missal only gives it for use 'præter in Adventu Domini, in Quadragesima et in diebus feriis.'³ Is this, then, one of those assimilations to Roman use which are believed to have crept into this liturgy 'when the rite was for the most part neglected and the Roman Liturgy was used everywhere around'?⁴

In the same way it was probably introduced into the Eucharistic service of other countries. In Ireland it is found in the Stowe Missal (fol. 14 b), the first part of it being in the older and larger handwriting assigned to the ninth century. England perhaps owes its introduction into the Missal to the Roman Mission under S. Augustine, although direct proof of the fact is not forthcoming. The only Missals of the Anglo-Saxon Church which remain are of a far later date. Of these the hymn is not found in the tenth-century Sacramentary written in Lotharingia, which forms the main portion of the Leofric Missal (*i.e.* that part called by Mr. Warren Leofric A), but it is alluded to several times in the 'catch-words' added in the margin by a later hand (Leofric C). It is given in full in the eleventh-century Missal at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (No. 270), probably written for the use of the Church of Canterbury; and the Missal of Robert of Jumièges at Rouen (Y, 6) recognizes it.⁵ This MS. is believed to have been written early in the eleventh century. If so, it can be but little later than the Bodleian Tropary (Bodley, 775), the date of which is some time between A.D. 979 and 1016 (see the prayer on fol. 18b, 'Ut Æthelredum regem et exercitum anglorum conservare digneris'). In this

¹ Fourth Council of Toledo, Can. xii., 'Et ille hymnus quem nato in carne Christo angeli cecinerunt *Gloria* . . . voluntatis angelicus est. Reliqua quæ ibi sequuntur ecclesiastici doctores composuerunt. Ergo nec ipsi in ecclesia canendi sunt, quia in sanctorum scripturarum locis non inveniuntur . . . Sicut igitur orationes ita et hymnos in laudem Dei compositis nullus nostrorum ulterius improbet.'

² *Adv. Elipand.* l. i. c. 66. It is quite possible, however, that this refers only to the first verse, Luke ii. 14, which stands independently (as in some Eastern liturgies) in the 'Missale Gothicum' for Christmas Day. Muratori, *Lit. Vet.* ii. p. 522.

³ Migne, lxxxv. p. 531.

⁴ Hammond, p. lxvi.

⁵ See the rubric quoted by Mr. Warren, 'Leofric Missal,' appendix, p. 281.

no
if
bee
con
Pr
the
Ox
of
t
Psa
as
the
an
it
ano
290
dom
(ten
Bod
S. G
nint
thro
duct
by
mus
maj
In s
Mus
Psal
(xi)
title
Univ
Lat.
427
(ix)
Paris
xvi.
laud
Ano
pura
Regi
bridg
I. 10
17
MSS.

no less than fourteen farsed *Glorias* are given, which looks as if the introduction of the hymn itself into the Mass can have been of no recent date. Other early Troparies and Graduals containing it are the following: Paris 9448, a Gradual of Prum of the tenth century; 903 and 1120, Limoges MSS. of the eleventh century; and the well-known 'Notker's Tropary,' Oxf. Seld. 27. Other early indications of the connexion of the hymn with the Eucharistic service in various countries may be found in the titles prefixed to it in some early Psalters, although its presence in the Psalters must be taken as a distinct 'survival' from the time when it was sung in the daily morning office. In the British Museum there is an eleventh-century Psalter, written in this country, in which it is entitled *Hymnus ad Missam* (Vitellius E. xviii.); and another of the same date which comes from Germany (Harl. 2904), which gives the title as *Hymnus ad Missam in diebus dominicis*. Still earlier are the following: Salisbury, 180 (tenth century), *Hymnus in diebus festis canendus ad Missam*; Bodleian, Douce 59, *Hymnum Angelicum ad Missam*, and S. Gall, 15, *Ymnum ad Missam diebus dominicis* (both of the ninth century). It is possible that some fresh light may be thrown on the early use of the hymn and the date of its introduction into the Mass in the different Churches of the West by a careful examination of existing Psalters, although we must confess that we have not got much help from the majority of those which we have personally examined. (1) In some MSS. there is no title at all to the hymn, viz. British Museum, Nero C. iv. (xii);¹ Lansd. 383 (xii), and the Utrecht Psalter, Claudius C. vii. (ix); Cambridge, Trin. Coll., R. 17. 1 (xi); S. John's, B. 18 (xii); C.C.C. 391 (xi). (2) In others the title is *Hymnus Angelorum*: Arundel 60 (xi); Cambridge University Library, Ff. 1. 23 (xi); Bodleian, Canon. Patr. Lat. 88 (xi); Laud 127 (xi); *Cantus Angelicus*, Lambeth, 427 (ix); *Hymnus Angelicus*, Cambridge, C.C.C. 272 (ix), 411 (ix); British Museum, Royal 2. A. xx. (viii); Harleian 863 (x); Paris 1152 (ix); Bamberg Quadruple Psalter (x); Trèves, xvi. (x or early xi); Metz, 14 (x); *Hymnus Angelicus laudibus in nativitate Christi cantatus*, S. Gall, 20 (ix). (3) Another title occasionally found is the following: *Oratio pura cum laudatione*, Salisbury, 180 (x); British Museum, Regius, 2. B. v. (x); while the very curious MS. in the Cambridge University Library known as the Book of Cerne, Ll. 1. 10 (viii or ix) entitles it simply *Laus Dei*. From these

¹ The Roman figures in brackets denote the centuries to which the MSS. are assigned.

various titles nothing can be inferred as to its Eucharistic or non-Eucharistic use, but it is possible that a thorough research would bring to light others besides those few noticed above in which the occasion on which it was employed is stated. Till this necessary work is taken in hand we must rest content with the facts that have here been brought together.

It will be seen from all that has been said that we have definite and clear knowledge of the use of the hymn in the services of the Western Church from the earliest years of the sixth century. Can it be traced back in the West to a still earlier date? All that we can say on this point is that we have no *certain* evidence of its use prior to the century just named. One earlier mention of it is sometimes quoted. The passage stands in a treatise doubtfully assigned to Victor Vitensis (c. 480), *Passio Liberati et Sociorum*. It runs as follows:

'Incedebant itaque cum fiducia ad supplicium quasi ad epulas concurrentes una voce per ambitus platearum decantantes Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.'¹

There is, however, no certainty that this refers to anything more than the first clause from S. Luke ii. 14, which was beyond all question used as a hymn of praise from very early times. Instances of its use in the Eastern liturgies have been already collected. In the West it must have been widely known and thoroughly familiar at an early date for the ecclesiastical version to hold its own so persistently in spite of Jerome's different rendering in the Vulgate. We come here upon a perplexing question, and one likely to try the reader's patience, but still one which deserves a brief consideration. The copies of the Old Latin Version which have come down to us vary in a very remarkable manner.

Codex Vercellensis, a European text of the fourth century, has 'Gloria in excelsis Deo et *super terram* pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.'

Codex S. Germanensis, 1 (European), 'Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax in hominibus bonæ voluntatis.'

Codex Monacensis and *Codex Brixianus*² (Italic of the sixth and eighth centuries), and *Codex Aureus Holmiensis* (mixed), 'Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.'

Codex Corbeiensis (a mixed text, said to be very ancient) has 'Gloria in *altissimis* Deo et in terra pax in hominibus bonæ voluntatis.'

Codex Veronensis (European, fourth or fifth century) has the same, but omits the preposition before 'hominibus.'

¹ Migne, lvii. p. 263.

² Considered as the best type of the Italic text before S. Jerome's revision.

simi
Colb
befo
J
For
pax

vers
Jero
the
in h
in th
(The
Test
Test
them
exist
nativ
posit
litur
ently
befo
Jero
cate
and
that
in hi
first
A tra
with
perso
duce
justif
ties
patre
Rem
have
stater

1 S
&c., v
we can
we fin
also su
2 H
4 J

Codex Palatinus (African, fourth or fifth century), 'Gloria altissimis Deo et pax in terra hominibus bonæ voluntatis.' So *Codex Colbertinus* (European, eleventh century), except that it inserts 'in' before 'altissimis.'

Jerome's Vulgate, as represented by *Codex Amiatinus*, *Fuldensis*, *Forojuliensis*, and others, reads 'Gloria in altissimis Deo et in terra pax in hominibus bonæ voluntatis.'

From all this it will be seen (1) that the two competing versions 'in excelsis' and 'in altissimis' both existed before Jerome's day, and (2) that there is but slight authority for the reading 'in hominibus' earlier than his time. He himself in his works quotes the version 'Gloria in excelsis,' &c., but in the Vulgate, as stated above, retains the other rendering. (The reader will scarcely need the reminder that in the New Testament Jerome's work was to *revise*, not, as in the Old Testament, to form an entirely new translation. Probably, then, this rendering was that which he found in most of the existing copies.) Now it is scarcely likely that (1) the alternative rendering 'in excelsis' and (2) the omission of the preposition 'in' would, not merely have found their way into the liturgical text, but also have held their own there so persistently, unless the Church had grown used to this rendering before Jerome's version made its way; and the fact that Jerome quotes it not once nor twice only would seem to indicate that it was the rendering most familiar to him personally, and therefore we seem fairly justified in drawing the conclusion that this verse at least was already used liturgically in the West in his days.¹ But of the date when the hymn as a whole was first introduced into the West we have no certain knowledge. A tradition which can boast of no great antiquity connects it with the name of Hilary of Poitiers, in himself a not unlikely person (owing to his residence in the East) to have introduced it into the West; but the evidence is not sufficient to justify us in taking the fact as proved. The earliest authorities speak vaguely of 'ecclesiastici doctores'² or 'sancti patres'³ as having added the latter part to the hymn. Remigius of Auxerre⁴ (b. 908) is the earliest writer that we have come across to mention Hilary as the author. His statement is copied by the pseudo-Alcuin⁵ in the eleventh

¹ Still earlier authority is sometimes quoted for 'Gloria in excelsis,' &c., viz. that of the old Latin translation of Irenæus, Bk. III. xi. 3, but we cannot appeal to this with any confidence, as in the very next section we find the verse quoted 'in altissimis,' where the context confirms it, and also suggests the reading 'super terram.'

² Fourth Council of Toledo.

⁴ *De Celebr. Missæ*, l. i.

³ Walafrid Strabo.

⁵ *De Div. Off.* c. 40.

century, and repeated by later writers, such as Hugh of S. Victor¹ and Honorius of Autun,² and according to Bona³ the hymn is commonly ascribed to Hilary in the missals. One solitary notice from Ireland is worth quoting. It occurs in the preface to the *Gloria*, in the *Liber Hymnorum*, and is translated by Dr. Todd as follows:—

'The angels of God sang the first verse of this hymn on the night of the Lord's nativity. They made it at the tower of Gabder⁴ (*sic*), a mile from Jerusalem eastward. To make known that He who was then born was the Son of God they made it. In the time of Octavin Augustus it was composed. But Ambrose made this hymn from the second verse to the end of the hymn.'⁵

Another equally curious piece of information is found in a Latin Psalter of the eleventh century, probably written in some Gallican monastery, and now in the Bodleian Library (Canon. Patr. Lat. 88). The *Gloria in Excelsis* is given on fol. 230 b, and after the words 'deprecationem nostram' there stands the following: '*Jacobus frater Domini Hierosolymitanus addidit, Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris miserere nobis. Cyrillus Alexandrinus adjunxit Quoniam tu solus, &c.*' The clauses which we have italicized are in red, the hymn itself being in ordinary black letters.⁶

Whence the Irish and Gallican scribes obtained their information we are unable to say. But their statements are worth little more than that of another Irish scribe, who gravely tells us that in the hymn 'there are seven chapters, and seven lines in each chapter, and seven syllables in each line!'⁷ For the present we must be content to remain in ignorance, hoping meanwhile that further research may throw fresh light on the early history of the hymn both in East and West, and put an end to the darkness which now surrounds its origin.

A few words must now be said on the subject of the versions which have been current in the West. That which may be termed the 'textus in ecclesia receptus' is so well known

¹ *De Sacr.* II. ix.

² *Gemma Anima*, l. i.

³ Lib. II. c. iv. Thomasius (iii. p. 616) gives it with the title 'Hymnus S. Hilarii ad Missam' in a Bible in the Vatican Library, Vat. 5729, and the same title is found in an eleventh-century Psalter in the Bibl. Ste. Geneviève (Al. 10) at Paris.

⁴ *I.e.* the tower of Eder (or the flock). It is curious how frequently this is connected with the scene of the angelic vision in ancient writers. See, e.g., Jerome, *Epit. Paula*, Epist. cviii., and *Quæst. in Genesin* (note on Gen. xxxv. 21).

⁵ *Liber Hymnorum* (ed. Todd), p. 177.

⁶ Sala in his notes to Bona (iii. p. 84) mentions another MS., which he assigns to the tenth century, containing the same tradition.

⁷ *Lib. Hymn.* ubi sup.

that
fixe
exa
but
sion
scar
canu
and
fili u
ever,
wort
ancie
from

'C
tatis.
adora
gloria
Jesu C
'A
tram.
subver
libera
schism
'Q
Jesu C
sæculo

Th
the Ir
author
slight
from t
tury, v
Liber

1.

¹ *E.g.*
tury?);
lxxi. p.
and som
² *Op*
ignores t
have.

³ So t
⁴ Met
here, as h
⁵ The
p. 227.
VOL.

that there is no need to quote it here. It must have been fixed and (so to speak) stereotyped at a very early date, as an examination of a large number of Psalters and Missals yields but the scantiest crop of various readings. Beyond an occasional unimportant change in the order of the words we have scarcely noticed any, except that the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum* has 'in gloriam (εις δόξαν) Dei Patris' in the last clause, and several manuscripts add the word *Altissime* after 'Domine fili unigenite Jesu Christe.'¹ Two other versions were, however, formerly current in the West, which are interesting and worth quoting in full. The first of them is found in the ancient Ambrosian Breviary, and is given by Thomasius² from the editions of 1539 and 1557. It runs as follows:

'Gloria in excelsis Deo: et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis. Laudamus te, hymnum dicimus tibi,³ benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te, gratias agimus tibi, propter magnam gloriam tuam, Domine Deus Rex cœlestis, Deus Pater omnipotens, Jesu Christe, Sancte Spiritus,⁴ Domine Deus Filius Patris.

'Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram. Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris, miserere nobis: miserere nobis: subveni nobis: dirige nos: conserva nos: munda nos: pacifica nos: libera nos ab inimicis, a tentationibus, ab hæreticis, ab Arrianis, a schismaticis, a barbaris.

'Quia tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Jesu Christe, in gloria Dei Patris, cum Sancto Spiritu, in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.'

The second version was seemingly the peculiar property of the Irish Church. For its text we have three independent authorities, all of which give the same version, though with slight variations of reading. The text given below is taken from the Bangor Antiphony of the seventh or eighth century, while the various readings appended come from the *Liber Hymnorum* at Dublin (A) and the Stowe Missal (B).⁵

1. Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.

¹ E.g. Bacon's Psalter at Cambridge (Ff. 1. 23); Trèves, xvi. (10th century?); Brussels, 8544 (14th century); the Gothic Breviary (Migne, lxxi. p. 886); the 'Missal Illyrici' (Martene, *De Ant. Rit. Eccl.* i. 492); and some of Daniel's MSS., *Thesaurus Hymnol.* ii. p. 275.

² *Opera*, iii. p. 613. The Ambrosian Breviary of S. Carlo, 1582, ignores the *Gloria*, and has the *Te Deum* alone, as other Western offices have.

³ So the Gothic Breviary and the Missal Illyrici.

⁴ Metz 452, a Gradual of the 12th century, has 'et Sancte Spiritus' here, as have some of Daniel's MSS.

⁵ The readings of this are taken from Mr. Warren's *Celtic Church*, p. 227.

2. Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te, magnificamus te,
 3. Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam misericordiam tuam
Domine Rex coelestis Deus Pater omnipotens.
 4. Domine Filii unigenite Jesu Christe Sancte Spiritus Dei, et omnes dicimus, Amen.
 5. Domine Filii Dei Patris, Agne Dei qui tollis peccatum mundi miserere nobis.
 6. Suscipe orationem nostram qui sedes ad dexteram Dei Patris miserere nobis.
 7. Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus gloriosus cum Spiritu Sancto in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.
-
3. pro (*for* propter) B.
 4. fili A. Add Dei B. unigeniti B.
 5. fili A. peccata A.
 6. orationes nostras B. sedis B. Omit Dei A. After nobis add Domine A.
 7. tu solus Dominus repeated B.

Besides these translations of the hymn it is not unusual to find in early manuscripts a Greek version in Latin characters. The origin of this must be sought in the ancient practice, mentioned by Martene,¹ of reciting the hymn in Greek on Christmas Day. Indeed in some places there was even a wider use of Greek in the Liturgy. In some manuscripts the *Gloria*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei* are all given in Greek, while we are told that 'on the festival of S. Denis the monks of the Abbey of S. Denis, near Paris, chanted the whole Mass in Greek in honour of the Greek apostle of France.'²

The following are some of the MSS. which contain this version: British Museum, Royal 2. A. xx. (8th century); Oxford, Bodley 775; and Notker's Tropary (Selden 27); Cambridge, Gg. V. 35; Vienna 1888; Paris 2290 and 2291. The text which follows is transcribed from the first of these, and we have not thought it necessary to add the variations found in other MSS.

‘Doxa en ipsistis theo kepi ges irini ennanthropois eudokia (*sic*)
enumen se eulogumen se proschunumen se doxalogumen se eucharis-

¹ *De Ant. Rit. Eccl. &c.*, i. iii. 2, § 6.

² Martene, *ub. supr.*, and *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, ii. p. 1017. In the last-mentioned work reference is made to a MS. of Limoges in the National Library at Paris (No. 4458) as giving the *Gloria*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei* in the Mass of Pentecost in Greek. The reference is incorrect, but should probably be to 1120; the *Gloria*, however, which is there given in Greek with the *Sanctus* and *Agnus* on fol. 38, is simply the *Gloria Patri*, and not, as is erroneously stated in the printed catalogue, the *Gloria in Excelsis*.

¹ For version of and finish
² On t Scudamor

tumen se dia ten megalin su doxam kirrie o theos basileu epuranie o theos patri pantokrator kirrie ie monogeni iesu christe kirrie o theos o amnos tu theu o ios tu patros o eron tas amartias tu chosmu eleison ymas o eron tas amartian (*sic*) tu chosmu prosdeke thin deysin ymon o chathemenos en dexia tu patros eleison ymas oti su monos agios su monos kurios su monos ipsistos iesu christo syn agion (*sic*) pneumatī is doxan theu patros. Amen.'

Still more curious is a version which, we believe, has never yet been printed. It stands in a magnificent tenth-century psalter in four columns (Jerome's three versions and the Greek) in the Royal Library at Bamberg. After the Psalms come the usual canticles, the Lord's Prayer, Apostles' Creed, 'hymnus matutinalis' (*i.e.* the *Te Deum*),¹ a Græco-Latin litany invoking more than 500 saints, the 'hymnus angelicus,' and Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. The Greek column in the psalter and canticles is written in Latin letters, but in the litany, the 'hymnus angelicus,' and the 'fides Catholica Nicæni concilii' the characters are Greek. The writer evidently had before him a copy in Latin letters, and did his best to turn it back into its original characters. The result can hardly be deemed satisfactory, for the scribe, it will be perceived, wrote Greek, as the Duke of Wellington spoke French, 'with a good deal of courage.' We give his version exactly as it stands in the MS., and trust that our readers will pardon its appearance in an unaccented condition, as we really have not the temerity to attempt to supply the usual adjuncts to the singular composition that lies before us.

Δοξα εν υψιστις θεω και επι γης ηρινι (εν sec. manu) ανθρωποις εὐδοκίας
αινουμεν σε ευλογουμεν σε
προσκινουμεν σε δοξολογουμεν σε
ευχαριστουμεν σε δια την μεγαλην σου δοξαν
Κυριε βασιλεν επουρανιε Θεε πατηρ παντοκρατορ.
Κυριε ινε (*sic*) μονογενη ιησουν χριστη Κε ο θεως ο αμνος του θεου ο
ιωης (*sic*) του πατρος ο ερον τας αμαρτιας του κοσμου προσδεξε τη δεση
ημον ο καθημενος εν δεξια του πατρος ελεησον ημας οτι συ μονος αγιος συ
μονος κηριος (*sic p. m. sed sec. m.* κυριος) συ μονος υψιστος ιησους χριστος
συν αγιω πνευματη (*sic*) ης δοξαν θεου πατρος αμην.

Our limited space does not permit us to enter upon the interesting topic of the 'farsed *Glorias*,'² but before concluding we must be permitted to revert to a subject mentioned at the beginning of this paper, viz. that of the antiphons or

¹ For the first eleven verses the scribe has actually added a Greek version of this. One only wishes that he had persevered with his attempt and finished the canticle. As it is the version is quite unique.

² On these a reference may be made to Bona, lib. II. c. iv. § 6, and Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 695 (ed. 1).

verses mainly taken from the Psalms, which are appended to the hymn in the Greek Psalters and Horologia. These always accompany it in Greek MSS., but their form is not quite the same everywhere. Altogether we have come across five different versions of them—(1) that in Codex Alexandrinus, the Zürich Psalter, Paris 22, *Suppl. Gr.* 610, 343, Bodl. Misc. Gr. 5, and Misc. 2 (which, however, is deficient in a great part of them), Trin. Coll., Oxon, 78, and C.C.C., Cambridge, 480; (2) Oxford Barocc. 15, British Museum Addl. 31214, 22507, Harl. 5541 (a), Paris 12; (3) Harl. 5441 (b); (4) Brussels 11332, Paris 40; (5) Paris 41. They are all much alike, containing many of the same verses, but with sufficient variety to denote that the precise form was not fixed at an early date. They are also found with further variations in Latin appended to the hymn in the Ambrosian Breviary, and to the version of the Irish Church in the Bangor Antiphonary and the *Liber Hymnorum*. Thus they appear to be its invariable adjunct when it occurs in the daily service in the place afterwards taken by the *Te Deum*. Now all the later verses of the *Te Deum*, from 'Per singulos dies,' &c. (except 27 and 29, which last certainly formed no part of the original hymn), are found in some of the versions of these antiphons, as is the 'Benedictus es Domine Deus patrum nostrorum,' &c. which appears in it in some MSS., and also 'Te decet laus, Te decet hymnus, Tibi gloria Deo Patri et Filio cum Sancto Spiritu, In sæcula sæculorum, Amen,' which is appended as if actually part of the *Te Deum* in Oxford, Canon. Patr. Lat. 88, and other MSS. In a previous article we pointed out that the earlier part of this hymn was drawn from the Eucharistic service of the Gallican Church, and we cannot help thinking that the original compositions may have ended with verse 21 or 23,¹ and that when it took the place of the *Gloria in Excelsis* in the daily service the antiphons which belonged to the older hymn were attached to it, and that this is the true account of the formation of the hymn in the shape in which it has come down to us. At any rate this theory has the merit of accounting for the variations found in the latter part of the hymn and for the additional verses sometimes found in connexion with it, while it offers the simplest solution of the question which has long puzzled us, how the two parts with undoubtedly different sources ever came to be joined together.

¹ Mr. Pott (*Te Deum and other Canticles*) has independently arrived at the conclusion that the later verses form an addition to the original hymn, but he has not explained so fully how they came to be tacked on to it.

For the sake of completeness we subjoin a copy of the antiphons as they stand in Harl. 5541 (2).

Καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν εὐλογήσω σε
 Καὶ αἰνέσω τὸ ὄνομά σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος.
 καταξιώσον Κύριε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἀναμαρτήτους φυλαχθῆναι ἡμᾶς.
 εὐλογητὸς εἰ Κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν
 καὶ αἰνετὸν καὶ δεδοξασμένον τὸ ὄνομά σου εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.
 γένοιτο Κύριε τὸ ἔλεός σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καθάπερ ἠλπίσαμεν ἐπὶ σε.
 εὐλογητὸς εἰ Κύριε διδάζον με τὰ δικαιώματά σου,
 εὐλογητὸς εἰ δέσποτα συνέρισόν με τὰ δικαιώματά σου,
 εὐλογητὸς εἰ ἅγιε φώτισόν με τοῖς δικαιώμασί σου.
 Κύριε τὸ ἔλεός σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Κύριε τὰ ἔργα σου μὴ παρίδῃς.
 σοὶ πρέπει αἶνος σοὶ πρέπει ὕμνος σοὶ δόξα πρέπει
 τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος
 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

ART. II.—JESSOPP'S DIOCESAN HISTORY OF NORWICH.

A Diocesan History of Norwich. By AUGUSTUS JESSOPP,
D.D. (S.P.C.K., London, 1884.)

IN our last number we took occasion from Mr. Benham's volume to ask the attention of our readers to the history of the great diocese of Winchester. Let us now pass to a different scene.

The diocese of Norwich has found its historian in Dr. Jessopp, for many years head-master of the grammar school in its cathedral city, which—although, in Mr. Freeman's words, it was one of the greatest seats of English commerce in the eleventh century and is ranked by Macaulay among the leading towns of England in the seventeenth—has no such stirring associations as belong to the old capital of Wessex, the home of a dynasty which grew into the royal line of England, the seat of a bishopric which, as Milner says, once 'nearly' became archiepiscopal, and the birthplace of the system of English public-school education. East Anglia has, on the whole, been debarred by its situation from taking an eminent part in the drama of English history, whether ecclesiastical or civil. The two most striking and attractive figures of its 'Saxon' period are those of its first bishop, S. Felix the Burgundian—'seated' at what was then the 'flourishing seaport of Dunwich,' and

tranquilly and (as Bede cannot help saying) 'feliciously' carrying out his missionary work in hopeful union with educational activities—and of its martyred king, S. Edmund, whom Carlyle, in his *Past and Present*, has made very real to modern readers as a true 'hero,' who 'was seen and felt by all men to have done verily a man's part in this life pilgrimage of his,' and to have well earned 'benedictions and outflowing love and admiration from the universal heart.' He and Oswald are perhaps the truest royal saints whom England has claimed as her own. The division of the diocese, under Archbishop Theodore, after the resignation of Bisi, the fourth bishop, had established a second see at North Elmham for the 'north-folk'; but the terrible Danish invasion, to which Edmund fell a victim in 870, suspended both the East Anglian successions until Eadulf reoccupied the chair of Elmham about the middle of the tenth century. Nine years after the Conquest, the Council of 1075 gave occasion for a transference of the see from the wooden church of that village to the stately minster of S. Mary-the-Great at Thetford, which was then the second town in East Anglia and possessed not less than thirteen churches. This took place in the episcopate of Herfast, who, although an illiterate man, had been chaplain to the Conqueror, and who underwent a serious mortification in the vain attempt to remove his seat yet again to the great Benedictine abbey which Cnut had founded at Bury S. Edmunds. Ethelmar, Bishop of Elmham in the Conqueror's reign, had recognized the exemption from episcopal jurisdiction which, even before his time, a Council of Winchester had granted to the house; and Abbot Baldwin, a man of high character, celebrated for his medical skill, found it easy to get this privilege conferred by Alexander II., to enlist the support of Gregory VII., and ultimately to prove his case before another assembly at Winchester in 1081. Herfast also got into trouble for what Dr. Jessopp calls 'an attempt to uphold the liberty of clerical wedlock.' But, as he shows in the context, the point for which Herfast in two cases practically contended was not that priests might be allowed to marry, but that they might continue to live with the wives whom they had married as laymen. A celebrated resolution of the Nicene Council brings out the difference between these two contentions. Herfast, however, could not withstand Lanfranc. He died in 1084.¹ His successor, William de Beaufeu, died in 1091. What ensued may best be told in the words of Dean Goulburn and Mr. Symonds,

¹ This is the date given in *Annal. de Wintonia*.

whose elaborate work on the *Life, Letters, and Sermons* of the founder of this cathedral is somewhat strangely ignored by Dr. Jessopp, although his assistance was warmly acknowledged in its introduction. The rich abbey of Ramsey, in Huntingdonshire, founded by a devout earl of the East Angles in the age of monastic revival, was then under the rule of an abbot named Herbert, whose surname, so to call it, of 'Losinga' was confidently interpreted by mediæval and later writers as an opprobrious *sobriquet* indicative of his 'leaving' or 'glozing' tongue—*quasi* 'the Wheedler' or 'the Flatterer.' But since, as it appears, his father Robert, for whom he procured the abbacy of New Minster at Winchester, was called Losinga, and since another Robert Losinga was Bishop of Hereford from 1079 to 1095, we may well believe with his biographers that the name was a patronymic, like so many others ending with *ing*, and denoted a family which may have left its traces in the 'hundred' of Loes in East Suffolk. Herbert had been trained in the monastery of Fécamp, and had improved his natural abilities by a diligent pursuit of all the learning of his time, including the revived study of Aristotle. He had returned to England in 1087, in order to preside at Ramsey; and Dean Goulburn thinks that it was during his tenure of the abbacy that the deterioration of his character commenced. It might well be stimulated, if not occasioned, by his acceptance of such an additional piece of preferment as the office of 'sewer,' or server-up of meals, to the Red King. Relying on royal favour, and also conscious of his own power and attainments, he naturally desired the vacant see of Thetford: and here we touch on one of those incidents of the feudalization of the hierarchy, which make up the interest of the contest about investitures.¹ Bishoprics had been richly endowed, and the endowments were necessarily regarded as fiefs. To them, therefore, as such, was applied the feudal maxim that the tenant, on being put in possession of his fief, must make a payment, technically called a relief, to his lord. Herbert, say his biographers, 'let the king understand that if he were appointed to the see of Thetford, and his father (now a widower) to the abbey of New Minster, the offering made in acknowledgment of those favours would be a handsome one.'² The bargain was struck accordingly. It was not a case of 'open and undisguised simony,' but the spirit of the proposal was simoniacal, and Herbert's memory has suffered in consequence. 'Fuit ergo vir ille magnus in

¹ See Dean Church's *Essays and Reviews*, p. 181.

² *Life, Letters, &c. of Herbert de Losinga*, i. 78.

Anglia simoniæ fomes' is the stern judgment of William of Malmesbury;¹ but he adds, following Florence of Worcester, that Herbert's repentance annulled the impulsive faultiness of his youth. He was, however, apparently more than forty at the time. At his consecration, when, according to the expressive ritual, the Gospel book was to be held over his head, it opened, by a significant coincidence, at the words 'Amice, ad quid venisti!' Unable to quiet his conscience, he resolved to resign his see, and, after encountering a burst of wrath from Rufus, he contrived to reach Rome, laid down his staff at the Pope's feet, and was by him absolved and reinstated, on condition, it is said, of founding certain churches by way of compensation for the scandal he had caused.

After his return, he followed out Lanfranc's policy by removing the see in 1094 from Thetford to 'the rich and populous Norwich,' where already the East Anglian prelates possessed a parochial church on the site of the present SS. Simon and Jude's, and a house just opposite on the site of the venerable 'Maid's Head Inn.'² He resolved to build a cathedral and a monastery in the large water-meadow called 'The Cowholm.' Roger Bigod, who held the castle of Norwich, took part in measuring out the ground, which was secured by the king's charter; and Herbert, as he stood over the foundation-stone, probably at the extreme east end of the present church, may have looked up to the vast fortress-mound with a determination that it should be duly confronted by the majesty of a 'palace not made for man.' So, as Mr. Freeman says, he began the 'vast minster which yet remains, whose size and stateliness struck men with amazement even in that day of great works.'³ What he built included the apsidal choir, or presbytery, the transepts, and the three easternmost bays of the nave; and preparations were made for a Lady-chapel, the walls and piers of which would have varied, says Dr. Jessopp (p. 232), from five to nine feet in thickness. Truly, Herbert was thorough in his operations. It was to be a monastic cathedral, modelled after that of Canterbury. The community consisted of sixty monks, whom Malmesbury panegyricizes for their brotherly spirit and strict observance of rule.⁴ Herbert's letters, translated by his biographers, show a genuine anxiety for the good order and spiritual welfare of the convent, which was under the immediate government of a prior; and it appears also that he was desirous to adopt for it

¹ *Gest. Pontif.* p. 151.² Blomefield, *Hist. of Norfolk*, iv. 353.³ *Norman Conquest*, iv. 421.⁴ *Gest. Pontif.* p. 152.

some of the customs which prevailed in the abbey of Fécamp, where he had made his own monastic profession.

The dedication of the new cathedral took place in September 1101. The founder's 'commanding personality,' says Dr. Jessopp,

'and the enthusiasm which fired his whole life, impressed themselves upon all who came in contact with him; the *furor* for building churches and monasteries which is so noticeable in East Anglia during Herbert's episcopate must have been largely the result of the bishop's direct influence and example.'

For, besides the cathedral, Herbert, whom Malmesbury calls 'non multum pecuniosus,' founded in Norwich the church and hospital of S. Paul, built churches at Elmham and Lynn, and reared at Yarmouth a Norman structure which has been developed into the largest of English parish churches. He established Cluniac monks in the ex-cathedral of Thetford, and preached in Ely abbey (three years before it became a cathedral) at the second translation of the relics of S. Etheldred. Truly 'out of the eater came forth meat.' It was, however, a backsliding on his part to try to purchase at the papal court (where, indeed, the force of golden arguments was already notorious) a permission to exercise jurisdiction over S. Edmund's Abbey; and in this attempt he failed, although he was at the time one of King Henry's envoys to Rome in the dispute with Anselm, and, as such, on his return, gave an account of Pope Paschal's mind which did not tally with the Pope's letters.¹ He was one of several prelates who had taken the king's side, but afterwards made overtures to Anselm to return and be their leader. He survived the saintly primate for ten years, dying in 1119; and his many fine points of character and remarkable warmth of heart must have made his funeral day very mournful to his diocese, as well as to the monks whom he had cherished and lovingly trained.

The unfinished nave of the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity was completed to its present length, which to some eyes will appear disproportionate, by his successor Everard, who, for some reason which Dr. Jessopp considers undiscoverable, was compelled to resign his bishopric in 1145. The next bishop, William Turbe, or Turberville, had been bred as a monk under Herbert's eye, and is described as 'the only bishop in England who stood by the dauntless primate,' Thomas, in his contest with Henry II. He had, indeed, shown some alarm at

¹ Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.* pp. 62, 65.

Clarendon, especially as he had previously offended the king by 'rebuking his vices.'¹ John of Salisbury once wrote to him, 'Perhaps you are for making temporary concessions, but the time for them will soon be past ;'² and the bishop obeyed his primate's order in 1166, by publishing the excommunication of Hugh Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, for occupying a few fields claimed by the six canons of Pentney ; and is said to have followed up this bold act by laying his staff on the altar and daring anyone to touch the property of his Church.³ He afterwards received similar instructions in regard to the excommunication of the Bishops of London and Salisbury,⁴ and his obedience made it necessary for him to avoid the king's anger by remaining within the monastery precinct. When he died, it was natural for Henry to secure the appointment of his former chaplain and confidential agent in the late contest, John of Oxford, who figures in the Becket letters as a usurper of the deanery of Salisbury,⁵ a 'schismatic,' who had fraternized with the party of the Anti-pope, and had therefore been excommunicated in 1166,⁶ but had been sent (not for the first time) as the king's envoy to Alexander III., whom he afterwards boasted that he had gained over, showing also a gold ring as given him by the Pope.⁷ He imputed the archbishop's acts to pure love of domination ;⁸ on the other hand, John of Salisbury wrote, 'The Church would have triumphed but for the intrigues of John of Oxford ;'⁹ and Becket classes him with 'ministers of impiety,'¹⁰ but had to accept his escort back to England, when John rebuked some of the primate's old foes for their violent language on his landing.¹¹ Such were the antecedents of the new Bishop of Norwich ; but in that position he used his influence with the king in favour of the immunities of the clergy, although to the last, says Dr. Jessopp, he remained a 'sagacious and accomplished man of the world,' with 'none of the devout sentiment of the *pietist*,' a term which in that connexion we dislike. His successor, John de Grey, was a partisan of King John, who would fain have seen him in the see of Canterbury. Matthew Paris calls him '*magni in Anglia et Hibernia occasio mali*,' and Dr. Jessopp says that during

¹ *Materials for Hist. of Abp. Becket*, ii. 381 ; iv. 34.

² *Ibid.* vi. 344.

³ *Ibid.* vi. 543 ff. ; Blomefield, iii. 474.

⁴ *Materials for Hist. of Abp. Tho. Becket*, vi. 560.

⁵ *Ibid.* v. 375.

⁶ *Ibid.* v. 503 ; i. 61.

⁷ *Ibid.* vi. 140, 151, 370, 468. The French queen wrote to the Pope, that John 'suo perjurio de Romana facile triumphavit.'

⁸ *Ibid.* v. 145.

⁹ *Ibid.* vi. 370.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* vi. 580.

¹¹ *Ibid.* iii. 116 ; i. 101.

his episcopate 'the man in East Anglia who, above all others, was the witness for earnestness and living faith and uncompromising uprightness, 'was—not the Bishop of Norwich, but Sampson, abbot of Bury S. Edmunds,' who had been appointed in Henry II.'s time, who could say when menaced by Cœur-de-Lion, 'Videat Altissimus!' and whose career, illustrious for nobleness of spirit, indomitable energy, laborious patience, and all-pervading religiousness, has been made so real to us by Carlyle.¹ Pandulph, before whom as legate the English crown had been abased, was bishop from 1222 to 1226; under his successor Blumville—not less, says Dr. Jessopp, of a self-seeking 'adventurer'—the friars settled in the diocese; Raleigh, of whom we heard in Mr. Benham's Winchester story, went over from the Court party to the national side. After him the see was filled by Walter Suffield, otherwise Calthorp, 'the only Bishop of Norwich whose saintly life has been his chief characteristic,' and whose memory was embalmed by a popular canonization. He was employed by the Pope to frame an assessment of English Church property, for the greater convenience of papal demand. This was called the Norwich taxation.² He was doubtless happier in presiding over his annual Michaelmas synod,³ or building that Lady-chapel which an Elizabethan dean thought good to destroy, or founding the Hospital of S. Giles, still existing to the north of the episcopal palace, and ordering, among other directions for its government, that as often as a bishop of the see went by, he should go in and give his blessing to the sick there; and that on that day, for the weal of the living and the dead, the thirteen poor men for whose partial support he ordinarily provided should have all their meals in the hospital.⁴ The poor of Norwich were not likely to forget that in a scarcity he sold even his silver spoons for their relief.⁵ His will shows a deep affectionateness of nature and a kindly remembrance of servants and humble friends, such as grooms, cooks, scullions, hostlers, 'Roger the carter,' 'Nicolas and William, his pages,' 'the porter's boy,' &c. One mediæval characteristic appears in his bequests to *lepers*. This good man died in 1257. The next bishop but one was Roger de Skerning, in whose time took place the great conflict of 1272 between the citizens and the cathedral monks, in regard to which, Dr. Jessopp says, 'there remains little room for doubting that the priory was almost wholly to blame.' He does not, however, explain that the quarrel originated in

¹ *Past and Present*, b. ii. c. 15.² Collier, *E. H.* ii. 519.³ Wilkins, i. 708.⁴ Blomefield, iv. 383.⁵ Matt. Paris, v. 638.

the monks' claim to hold a fair in Tombland, just outside their precinct, without interference from the citizens; and anyone who observes the amplitude of that precinct, and pictures to himself its condition, when strongly walled, and occupied by the buildings of a great Benedictine monastery, possessing all the prestige of a cathedral with a resident bishop, will understand that many causes might produce bad blood between such an ecclesiastical aristocracy and the burghers of a wealthy provincial capital. The bishop, not unnaturally, sided with his convent, and 'proceeded with passionate haste to take vengeance on the accused'; but 'the prior, for his part in the outbreak, was virtually deposed.'¹

The present Ethelbert-gate, at the south-west corner of the Upper Close, was built by the citizens as a compulsory atonement for the destruction of S. Ethelbert's² church in their onslaught on the belfry tower. Six years afterwards, on Advent Sunday in 1278, Bishop Middleton was enthroned, and reopened the cathedral after necessary repairs. It was this bishop who was the occasion of the passing of the statute 'Circumspecte agatis,'³ which at once secured and limited the area of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

A long note to the seventh chapter gives proof that Archbishop Peckham, ten years later, found the Norfolk monasteries in a creditable state; but this Primate, before consecrating Ralph de Walpole for Norwich, required him to give up, as 'displeasing to God and man,' that claim to the first-fruits of vacant benefices which had been invented by Pandulph. Bishop Salmon, however, renewed this claim. He was Chancellor of England in 1320, and did his best as adviser of Edward II., who in 1325 was obliged to acquiesce in the appointment of Ayermin or Armine, a scandalous time-server who had deserted his falling cause. In 1337 Antony de Bek, nephew and namesake of a great Bishop of Durham, was placed in the see by papal favour, and induced the people to support him in resisting a metropolitical visitation by Archbishop Stratford, who attempted to set forth his claim from a pulpit erected in Tombland, west of the cathedral, but found it impossible to get a hearing.

Dr. Jessopp says that Bek tried to make the priory of Norwich subject to the bishop. The fact seems to be,

¹ Barth. de Cotton, the monastic annalist, says that 'rich men' slandered the prior, *Angl. Sac.* i. 400.

² Not our first Christian king, but a young East Anglian king murdered in Mercia, by order of King Offa or his queen. See Freeman's *Old English History*, p. 86.

³ Collier, ii. 528; ix. 40.

according to the continuator of Cotton, that the senior monks successfully maintained 'quod electio officiariorum ad majora officia tantum pertinuit ad priorem et seniores.' He is said to have been poisoned by his servants. The next episcopate brings us to the awful year of the Black Death, the ravages of which in East Anglia have been also described by Dr. Jessopp in the *Nineteenth Century* of December 1884 and April 1885, where he remarks that there is no record of 'cowardly desertion of duty,' and that 'the intrepid bishop' Bateman, as if determined to show 'an example of the loftiest courage,' remained for weeks during that frightful summer of 1349 in his palace on the north of the cathedral, exposed to 'the stench of putrefaction from the great cemetery in the Close, until the house became absolutely uninhabitable, when he removed into Suffolk, returning to the neighbourhood of Norwich in October.' Here we are told that, after his return to England from a foreign political mission, Bateman confronted the pestilence in his diocese; and that, as it is impossible to estimate the number of clergy in that diocese whom the Black Death carried off at less than two thousand, he was perpetually employed in instituting new incumbents. 'In the single month of July'—amid the horrible reek of pestilence—'he personally instituted 207 persons.' 'In view of the serious falling off of the supply of clergy,' he 'was authorized to ordain sixty young men . . . who might be two years under the canonical age,' if they were otherwise well qualified, but 'he exercised this right' in 'only five instances.' However, he seems to have been disheartened by a natural deterioration in the type of the parochial clergy; and if he took away the advowsons and endowments of country cures for the benefit of monasteries or of his own new college of Trinity Hall, he 'had at any rate no mean and selfish aim.' He had persuaded himself that this was, under the circumstances, the most effective way of promoting the interests of religion. But the condition of the town parishes became very bad; they were served by 'vicars' of the monastic 'rectors,' and it was well when the friars were at hand to preach to the townsfolk, although they, too, were approximating to the habits of the older orders, and abandoning the severe simplicity which had made them at first the evangelizers of the poor.

Bishop Bateman revived the old question of the exemption of S. Edmundsbury, but without success. He came into collision with temporal officers, and actually succeeded in compelling a powerful noble who had committed violence within his manors to walk barefoot to the cathedral, holding

a wax taper, and to humble himself at the high altar for his offences. He died in 1369, and was succeeded by an ex-soldier, Henry de Spenser, whom Walsingham¹ describes in laudatory style as *episcopus Martius, antistes belliger*, inasmuch as he resumed his old occupation by going forth, lance in hand, against a Norwich dyer who was imitating Wat Tyler; and Capgrave,² who argumentatively 'excuses, or rather defends,' this conduct on the part of the prelate, tells us how, on hearing that this 'Jack Lister' had gathered the 'robusti villarum adjacentium' to make a stand at Walsham for the good of the commonalty, the bishop hastened thither, found the way barricaded, but prevailed on the people to accept terms, and caused Lister, who had hid himself amid rushes, to be hunted out, beheaded, and quartered. 'These are the deeds of this respected bishop.' He was equally zealous against heretics, and vowed that he would give to fire or sword any Lollard caught preaching in his diocese. *Sit nomen ejus*, cries Walsingham, *benedictum in sæcula!* But when Walsingham says that while he did the full duty of a soldier, *pontificale non neglexit debitum*, we cannot accept Dr. Jessopp's rendering—'so did he not forget the debt he owed to the Pope.' Clearly the words mean simply, 'he did not neglect his duty as a *pontifex* or bishop.' He succeeded in extracting, for the time, a recantation from William Sawtre, the first victim of the Act *De hæretico comburendo*, and it is but fair to say that he seems to have been kind to the poor, and very popular among them. He was taken fatally ill while reciting the twenty-fourth Psalm, August 23, 1406. Bishop Wakering, who thrice emancipated serfs, was stern to Lollards, although none suffered death under his rule; but Bishop Alnewick, whose work is visible at the west end of the cathedral, effectually silenced East Anglian Lollardism by the doom pronounced on William White as a relapsed heretic, in 1428. For most part of this century the Bishops of Norwich were peaceable and highly-cultured prelates. Among them may specially be mentioned Walter le Hart, or Lyhart, who had been provost of Oriel, was a 'friend and patron of scholars,' rebuilt the cathedral spire, and vaulted the nave. He had a suffragan in the high-born Thomas Scrope, renowned, says Dr. Jessopp, for learning and asceticism, who had for many years been a Carmelite in Norwich, and died, nearly a centenarian, in 1491. The country clergy also were 'respected and loved by their people,' and Wycliffism appeared for the

¹ *Hist. Angl.* Rolls Series, ii. 7, 189, 274.

² *Angl. Sac.* ii. 360.

time to have been stamped out. Under Bishop Nix, or Nykke, Bilney, who had recanted, and 'relapsed,' was degraded, and burned in 'Lollard's pit,' near the Wensum, August 19, 1531. The 'burning of three others in earlier years of Nix's episcopate can at the most have been no more than *branding*;' but he was undoubtedly zealous against 'heretics,' and active in the suppression of 'heretical' literature. He died in 1536, after undergoing several humiliations at the hands of Henry VIII. and Cranmer, and his last days must have been further saddened by the rapacious tyrant's onslaught on Norfolk monasteries. 'The report which professes to tell of their condition in 1535,'¹ says Dr. Jessopp,

'is a paper which bears upon its every line the marks not only of falsehood, but of revolting grossness on the part of those who could write it, and it is not conceivable that it could have been accepted as anything but a hideous invention by those to whom it was handed in . . . It is valuable as showing the character of the wretches whom Cromwell had in his pay. . . . The report seems never to have been made any use of; it was evidently considered unsafe to take the next step on testimony so entirely worthless.'—(P. 164.)

The suppression of monasteries in the diocese caused 'misery, amazement, perplexity, and despair.' Old Bishop Nix was succeeded by William Rugg, or Repps, abbot of Hulme in Norfolk, who in return for his appointment made what Bishop Tanner called the 'fatal exchange' of all the property of the see, except the palace, for the revenues of his own surrendered convent, and of the small priory of Hickling;² and the abbacy was united by an act of parliament to the bishopric, a curious result of which was that Bishop Hall, when stripped of all his other possessions, was able to present to a benefice in his quality of titular abbot of a foundation which traced itself to Cnut (pp. 34, 168, 208). Such is the irony of history. Norwich like Winchester, received a 'new foundation,' as the church of a dean and canons, in 1539. From the day of Rugg's appointment, we are told, 'he set himself to make all he could of whatever was saleable.' At last, in 1549, he 'was induced to resign. He could be borne with no longer.' The government would be the more ready to 'get rid' of him, as Blomefield phrases it, because

¹ See Dixon's *Hist. of Ch. of Engl.* i. 344 ff.

² On this 'thorough plundering' of the bishopric, see Dixon, i. 367. In 1528 Clement VII. had authorized a scheme whereby the Bishop of Norwich should have the monastery of Hulme (its abbacy being suppressed) in exchange for the 'first-year fruits' of all benefices in the diocese. Dugdale, *Mon. Angl.* iii. 94.

he was 'a rigid Roman Catholic,' or, more properly, was hostile to any further doctrinal alterations than the abolition of papal supremacy. Dr. Jessopp calls him 'truculent,' which seems rather too much to say on the ground (we presume) of his alleged instigation of the burning of one Rogers in 1546. He was succeeded by Thirlby, formerly bishop of Westminster while that abbey was a cathedral. Dr. Jessopp passes over the really formidable insurrection of Kett and his followers, as belonging properly to civil history. One famous ecclesiastic was imperilled by it. Archbishop Parker, a Norwich man born, must sometimes have recalled that summer day in 1549 when he argued with the insurgents at 'the Oak of Reformation,' was denounced as a 'hiring doctor *waged* by gentlemen,' and might have had his career cut short had not Kett's chaplain opportunely started the *Te Deum*. Our author's estimate of the Edwardian and Elizabethan administration of the Church in East Anglia will hardly be gratifying to Protestant idealizers. 'The terrible oligarchy' under 'the boy king' is exhibited as ruthlessly pillaging what Henry VIII. had left, including the parish guilds—in other words, the religious benefit clubs of the poor, with their incomes and their humble furniture, and 'the churches in towns and villages' down 'to the bare walls;' and we learn from Blomefield that in 1547 the cathedral plate was diminished from 592 ounces to 271. Simony was rampant along with sacrilege. Dr. Jessopp does not hesitate to say that

'the deplorable confusion of the last fifteen years had made the people sick of all the changes, and when the Mass was restored in the churches it was welcomed by the multitude with enthusiasm.'

At any rate, there would be decency and reverence, and the house of God would be safe from further plundering. But Mary's infatuation turned the tide. The burning of nine persons at Norwich under Bishop Hopton's authority, as exercised by his chancellor Downing, whom Dr. Jessopp calls 'far more merciless' than himself, served to 'increase the number and earnestness' of the '*Gospellers*'; and Hopton's death, soon after Elizabeth's accession, was attributed, says Blomefield, chiefly to 'grief and fear.' His successor, Parkhurst, once the tutor of Jewel, 'showed a bad example by making merchandise of the Church of God.' He was blamed, said Cecil, 'even of the best sort for his remissness in ordering his clergy'; and his lavish housekeeping and facile good-nature might seem the survival of the old habits of a 'popular

and amusing' Fellow of Merton. Bishop Freake, who came to Norwich in 1575, would have been translated to Ely but for his honest refusal to assist the 'Governess of the Church' in plundering that bishopric. He was not allowed to carry out a scheme for bringing the influence of rural deans to bear upon his clergy. He was succeeded in 1584 by a man whose monument in Norwich Cathedral entitles him a 'confessor'—Edmund Scambler, 'notorious as a shameless spoiler in a generation of shameless spoilers' (p. 175), and of whom Blomefield says that 'soon after his coming he began to impoverish the see also, as he had done Peterborough.' Surely in no other country was the Reformation associated with such base forms of worldliness. The 'Occidental star' was baleful, in many respects, to the Church under its tutelage; yet it is fair to observe that Elizabeth, after she had nearly been made a tool of by unprincipled assailants of the rights of the see and the chapter of Norwich to their estates, caused the matter to be set right by a statute and a judicial decision in 1597.¹ Anglicanism, as a whole, was associated much more with State authority than with spiritual energy; nor can we wonder that Puritanic zeal found vent in irregular 'prophesyings,' or meetings for discussion of Scripture; that exiled 'weavers from the Low Countries' contributed to make Norwich a centre of Puritanism; that Robert Brown, a Norfolk clergyman, became the founder of the Separatists; that the Family of Love had a 'stronghold in East Anglia'; or that we hear of a poor ploughman near Norwich being burned for 'Anabaptistical and Arian opinions' in 1579.² It was altogether a dreary time, and it is well to have the truth told about it, without conventional optimism, under the auspices of the S.P.C.K. Dr. Jessopp's comment is, 'The Master's promise has been found true in *the darkest hour*.' Norwich Cathedral was in a corrupt state; the canons were negligent of residence and duty, and we are told that in 1572 there was 'an outrageous riot' on the part of nearly the whole cathedral body. In 1603 the newly arrived Scotch king appointed a Scotchman (Montgomery) to the deanery, who next year got three Irish bishoprics, and only visited Norwich on 'audit days.' James, however, took a better course in providing, by parochial taxation, for a better maintenance of the clergy of Norwich. It is curious that in his reign the bishop was regarded as having a spiritual relation to the foreign Protestant residents, so that cases of difference discussed in their

¹ Collier, vii. 238 ff.

² Perry, *Student's Engl. Ch. Hist.* ii. 315.

own synod were 'ripped up and heard before the lord bishop.'¹

The bishops between Bishop Jegon's death in 1617 and 'the general break-up' in 1641 had but short episcopates. Overall, who came from Lichfield, sat at Norwich about a year; his monument professes to have been erected by 'his former secretary and most devoted disciple, John Cosin, Bishop of Durham.' Laud's attempts to enforce conformity were seconded in 1634 by 'the witty' Bishop Corbet, who, as the archbishop complacently reports to the king,² 'put down some lectures,' suspended two clergymen, and frightened two wandering preachers out of the diocese. One of these suspensions was remarkable: William Bridges, incumbent of S. George's Tombland, in Norwich, submitted to the censure, but afterwards resigned his cure, retired to Holland, and ultimately became pastor of an Independent congregation formed at Norwich in 1644. Bishop Wren came to Norwich in 1635, and must have been disgusted to find his palace chapel occupied by French Protestants. He gave them notice to quit by Easter. He found, as Laud reports, 'that only four of the thirty-four churches in Norwich has a sermon in the morning, but all put off to the afternoon, and so no catechizing.' This he corrected. As to irregular 'lecturers,' he inhibited only six throughout the diocese, the rest promising to conform.³ But other Puritanical ministers were censured, and the king, through Laud, directed Wren to deprive those who were contumacious.⁴ In 1638 Wren obtained the richer see of Ely, and Montagu, the author of '*Appello Cæsarem*,' whose elevation to the episcopate ten years before had so deeply offended the Puritans, was translated from Chichester to the East Anglian bishopric. He wrote himself 'Bishop of Norwich and Lord Abbot of S. Benedict's de Hulme,' but unfortunately illustrated this latter title by leasing out the abbatial country estate to provide for his own family. He described his diocese as 'quiet, uniform, and conformable,' except that a few of the poorer people in Suffolk disliked coming up to communicate at the altar rail.⁵ Little could he foresee the outbreak of 'fierce antipathy to ecclesiastical order and authority' which was soon to charac-

¹ Blomefield, iii. 365.

² See Laud's *Works*, A.-C. Lib. v. 328.

³ Laud, v. 340.

⁴ *Ibid.* v. 350.

⁵ *Ibid.* v. 364. Montagu did, indeed, suggest, as a compromise, that persons should be communicated in 'ranks' in the chancel. Heylin's *Laud*, p. 366.

terize this apparent acquiescent flock. He lived to see the Long Parliament, but died, happily for himself, in 1641. His successor, Bishop Hall, though no 'Laudian,' experienced at the hands of Parliamentary officials such treatment as he himself describes in a narrative quoted by Dr. Jessopp, which also dwells on the sacrileges perpetrated at the cathedral, when church books and vestments were carried to be burned in the market-place, 'a lewd wretch' walking all the way in front, wearing a cope which 'trailed in the dirt,' and burlesquing the chant of the Litany. By the way, we may observe that a fair example of the result of concession to 'irreconcilables' may be found in a piece of Bishop Hall's experience, which we give on the authority of Blomefield. The two Puritan officials who visited Hall's palace chapel objected to the stained-glass figures of saints, and he asked and obtained leave to meet the objection by taking off the heads; 'but the good bishop needed not to have been so exact, if he could have thought of the consequences.' The windows were not saved by this poor compromise, but were soon afterwards smashed to pieces, and the lead was pulled off the roof and sold. This was 'thorough reformation.' Our author also gives some account of the 'rancorous cruelty' exhibited towards faithful clergymen of the diocese, whose sufferings, as he remarks on p. 206, threw utterly into the shade the forty-seven ejections of intruded ministers which were found necessary in 1662. Bishop Hall spent his later years in a suburb of Norwich, 'showing a brave heart and a Christian temper, which all the malice of his enemies could not ruffle.' He died in 1656. Of Edward Reynolds, who succeeded him after the Restoration, Dr. Jessopp asserts positively what the cautious Cardwell mentions as 'not improbable,'¹ that he was the author of our 'General Thanksgiving.' It seems almost if not quite certain that he was so; and in that case what daily gratitude do we owe to this quondam Puritan, who, as a Presbyterian Dean of Christ Church, had been ejected by the Independents! A good man indeed he was. His mild and gentle rule, his 'unbounded charity' in the time of the plague, and his activity in improving the condition of the poorer clergy, endeared him to his flock. The people, on their part, were willing enough to return to Church ways; the city made some amends for past spoliation by giving '100*l.* for plate for the altar'; and the High Sheriff of Norfolk gave a cope, which was in existence, and perhaps in use, when Blomefield wrote in 1743. Bishop

¹ *Conferences*, p. 372.

Sparrow, a man of a much higher type of Churchmanship, also made himself respected and beloved, and died in 1685, about three months after Charles II. Bishop Lloyd, at the Revolution, set his own course by Sancroft's, and as leader of the Non-jurors practically 'effaced himself.'

Dean Prideaux is described as the most vigorous personage in the diocese at the beginning of that eighteenth century which saw seven bishops pass away from Norwich to sees regarded as more eligible,¹ and which also brought out in Wesley's painful experience that 'cold and lethargic temperament of the East Anglian people' (as Dr. Jessopp characterizes it) which kept them in contented spiritual 'deadness,' while 'elsewhere religious life began to revive.' Carelessness and non-residence were rife among the clergy. The cathedral city was a well-known stronghold of Unitarianism; and Harriet Martineau was born there, of a Unitarian family, shortly before the accession of Bishop Bathurst, who got credit for liberality by entertaining Dissenters at the palace, and calling a Unitarian preacher 'Brother Madge.' Bathurst lived on, as 'the Whig Bishop,' beyond the age of ninety; he simply let the Church drift, and 'it was' his successor, 'Bishop Stanley, who began in earnest that vigorous stirring of the dry bones which has never since his days been allowed to rest.' He was, indeed, most active in promoting education and religious activity. We believe that in his last moments he was heard to murmur, 'If they were but twenty they should have their second service;' but from so pronounced a latitudinarian could come no encouragement to what our author calls a 'wonderful revival of zeal and loyal Church feeling,' and as little from his successor, Bishop Hinds, who might be called a client of Archbishop Whately. Just enough is said of the present bishop to indicate his claim on the respect and gratitude of his diocese. But Dr. Jessopp's account of its condition may, perhaps, be balanced by statements made in the *Guardian* of September 3, 1879, on the authority of Bishop Pelham's charge of that year. We hope that there is some improvement since it could be said, as it then was said, that 'in a fifth of the whole number of churches Holy Communion was only celebrated four or six times in the year;' that 'the School Board system had engulfed nearly a fourth part of the schools,' and that the Diocesan Board of Educa-

¹ Among these was Gooch, who founded a society for the support of clergymen's widows and orphans, and also stopped the thoroughfare through the nave (Abbey and Overton, *Engl. Ch. in Eighteenth Century*, ii. 419).

tion was but inadequately supported. 'A Suffolk incumbent' added by way of comment that the Low Church party had for generations been predominant, and 'that the Baptist form of Dissent had a stronger hold than in most counties.'

This History ends with hopeful auguries for the future of the Church of England, 'as long as we are alive in faith and prayer and practice,' inasmuch as changes which had seemed to bode destruction did but rouse the Church to 'new and unexpected vigour.'

Dr. Jessopp is an inspiring writer, with a keen sense of historical justice, which we might have further illustrated from his estimate of those famous monasteries which rose up in the later Saxon times 'among the desolate swamps and dreadful morasses' in the centre or on the borders of East Anglia. He has taken great pains to examine diocesan and archidiaconal records and parochial registers. We have already noticed one or two oversights in his narrative; at p. 83 we must correct 'the French king' into the 'French king's son' (afterwards Louis VIII.); and it is rather surprising to find the Britons called *simpliciter* 'those poor forefathers of ours' (p. 3), or Stephen referred to as a 'savage tyrant' (p. 68), still more so, perhaps, to see the difference between a prebend and a prebendary ignored—not once nor twice. Nor could we, for our part, have spoken of the 'cruelties practised upon the wretched Titus Oates' without adding, in the words of Macaulay, that his sufferings 'did not equal his crimes,' in that he had been guilty, several times over, of 'the most aggravated species of murder'—a judgment which, we are sure, Dr. Jessopp would be the last to question.

If we are to compare the two diocesan histories, that of Winchester, by Mr. Benham, reviewed in our last number, and this of Norwich, by Dr. Jessopp, we cannot hesitate to say that the less attractive and dignified of the two themes has received the fuller and more truly scholarly treatment.

ART. III.—BUDDHISTIC THEOSOPHY.

1. *Buddha : his Life, his Doctrine, his Order.* (*Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde.*) By Dr. HERMANN OLDENBERG, Professor at the University of Berlin. Translated by Dr. William Hoey. (London, 1882.)
2. *The Occult World.* By A. P. SINNETT, President of the Simla Eclectic Theosophical Society. Fourth Edition. (London, 1884.)
3. *Esoteric Buddhism.* By the same author. Third Edition. (London, 1884.)
4. *Buddhism.* By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, M.A., Ph.D. Tenth Thousand. (London, 1882.)
5. *Earth's Earliest Ages and their Connexion with Modern Spiritualism and Theosophy.* By G. H. PEMBER, M.A. (London, 1884.)
6. *The Christian College Magazine.* September and October, 1884. (Madras.)
7. *A Report of an Examination into the Blavatsky Correspondence published in the Christian College Magazine.* By J. D. B. GRIBBLE, Madras C.S. (retired), late Officiating Judge of Tranquebar, Nellore, and Cuddapah. (Madras, 1884.)
8. *Report of Observations made during a Nine Months' Stay at the Head-Quarters of the Theosophical Society at Adyar (Madras), India.* By J. HARTMANN, M.D., F.R.S. (an American Buddhist). (Madras, 1884.)
9. *Some Account of my Intercourse with Madame Blavatsky from 1872 to 1884, with a number of Additional Letters and a full Explanation of the most marvellous Theosophical Phenomena.* By Madame COULOMB. (London, 1885.)
10. *The Theosophical Society. Official Report of the Ninth Session of the General Convention and of the Celebration of the Ninth Anniversary at Madras, December 27-31, 1884.* (Madras, 1885.)
11. *Report of the Result of an Investigation into the Charges against Madame Blavatsky, brought by the Missionaries of the Scottish Free Church at Madras, and examined by a Committee appointed for that purpose by the General Council of the Theosophical Society.* (Madras, 1885.)

IT is sufficient to say by way of preface to the present discussion, or perhaps by way of apology for entering upon it,

that Buddhism is one of the great religions of the world : we should hardly be wrong if we said, is *the* great religion of the world, for it counts as its adherents the enormous number of 500,000,000 souls, or *forty per cent.* of the whole human race. It far outnumbers Christians of all shades, and may not unfairly claim to be, with Christianity and Mahommedanism, one great determining factor of the spiritual condition of mankind.

It is, however, to be remembered that this huge mass of belief or opinion is far from being homogeneous. Buddhism in Thibet (where it takes the form of Lamaism) and Buddhism among the cultured Singhalese are two very different things, though both one and the other are Buddhist Established Churches. Between the Northern and the Southern types of Buddhism, indeed, there is surprisingly little in common beyond the mere name. They do not appeal to the same standards of doctrine, or even to the same religious literature.¹ The peculiar character of this quasi-religion unquestionably facilitates this tendency to heterogeneity. It is, for one thing, exceedingly incomplete—we may call it fragmentary, considered as a religion. The enormous gaps which its votaries find in it are gradually but speedily filled with masses of the folklore of the district, and as this naturally varies in different districts, the beliefs of the peoples who inhabit them hardly resemble each other at all. These may be regarded as so many attempts to borrow what the system does not itself possess—a *theology*. For Buddhism proper has no conception of the Divine, no consistent eschatology, no feeling for the world and for temporal things beyond an impatient loathing and repulsion. Its entire energy is concentrated in the effort to undo and shake off all relations between the soul and its material environment. Success in this constitutes *Nirvana* an ascent into the *Atman*—that is, the Unchangeable, the Absolute, the *ens realissimum* or (strange to say) the Everlasting Negative.

The circumstances under which Buddhism originated

¹ Thus the sacred books of the Southern Buddhists, which are studied by their numerous monks in Ceylon, are the *Vinaya Pitaka*, a kind of monastic rule, and *Sutta Pitaka*, which are intended for the laity, and consist principally of collections of popular discourses remarkable chiefly for their great length. Under one heading alone Mr. Rhys Davids describes 'one hundred and fifty-two treatises of moderate size,' and the entire collection is calculated by the same authority, not quite adequately, at 1,752,800 words. Among the Northern Buddhists, on the contrary, these are not referred to as authorities, and beyond the *Lalit Vistara*, a legendary biography of Gautama, which is current in Thibet, China, and Nepal, their sacred books do not appear to be at all known.

account in a measure for these strange contradictions. It is itself a reaction: therefore partial, illogical, unsymmetrical, and incomplete. It was a product of that profound weariness of human life, that fatalist pessimism which saw no change and no hope for the individual or even for the race in the resistless stream of destiny, and therefore despaired utterly of the mass of mankind; of that contempt and loathing for the ordinary incidents of existence, and the adoption of a suicidal asceticism as the sole principle of salvation, which form an abiding tendency of the Eastern mind, and produced at intervals Brahmanism, Buddhism, and, *longo intervallo*, Gnosticism, which finally withered away in the presence of the more vigorous genius of Christianity.

Buddhism has, then, two aspects. In the first and more pleasing, it is an ethical rule embodying certain of the truths of natural religion. In the second (and later) it is an indeterminate system of ontological philosophy.

It is a *Rule*; but the Rule of a monastic order, not a guide for the conduct of all mankind. Indeed, the only *good* life according to Buddhist standards, is the monastic. Every good Buddhist *must* be a monk; and so only can Nirvana, *i.e.* salvation, be attained. In the view taken by the 'Rule' the world of human things is a mere *annexe* or appendage to the community. 'The monks alone,' observes Dr. Oldenberg, 'not the lay adherents, are exclusively members of the Church.' Beyond this call to all alike to embrace the ascetic life, Buddhism has no Gospel to proclaim to the world; and it is certain that a mere 'gospel of despair' can have little or no element of real permanence in it, however the *inertia* of the Eastern mind may disguise the fact, and can never supply appropriate and healthful food for the spiritual cravings of mankind.

'Of this life, which promises to the cheerful sturdiness of an industrious struggling people thousands of gifts and thousands of good things, the Indian merely scrapes the surface and turns away from it in weariness. . . . The Buddhist propositions regarding the sorrow of all that is transitory are the sharp and trenchant expression which these dispositions of the Indian people have framed for themselves, an expression the commentary to [qy. on] which is written, not alone in the sermon at Benares and in the apothegms [*sic*] of the Dhammapada, but in indelible characters in the whole of the mournful history of this unhappy people.'¹

Buddhist tradition relates that it was in the sermon to which reference is made above, delivered at Benares to an

¹ *Buddha*, p. 221.

audience of five monks and rival ascetics, that the career of Gautama Buddha as a teacher began. There, as his disciples express themselves, he 'set in motion the wheel of the law'; and if the tradition be trustworthy, as it seems to be, it is evident that already he had clearly thought out and firmly grasped the main positions of his scheme. The main foundations of Buddhist teaching are known by them as the Four (Great or) Noble Truths, and are thus stated in the Benares sermon:—

'This, O monks, is the sacred truth of suffering: birth is suffering; old age is suffering; sickness is suffering; death is suffering; to be united with the unloved is suffering; to be separated from the loved is suffering; not to obtain what one desires is suffering; in short, the fivefold clinging (to the earthly) is suffering.

'This, O monks, is the sacred truth of the origin of suffering: it is the thirst (for being) which leads from birth to birth, together with lust and desire, which finds gratification here and there: the thirst for pleasures, the thirst for being, the thirst for power.

'This, O monks, is the sacred truth of the extinction of suffering: the extinction of this thirst by complete annihilation of desire, letting it go, expelling it, separating oneself from it, giving it no room.

'This, O monks, is the sacred truth of the path which leads to the extinction of suffering: it is this sacred eightfold path, to wit: Right Faith, Right Resolve, Right Speech, Right Action, Right Living, Right Effort, Right Thought, Right Self-concentration.'—P. 211.

Each and all of these positions evidently rests on the axiom that *existence is in itself suffering*. To exist is suffering, therefore it is better not to exist: that is the sole underlying premise of all the Buddhist argument. Since, therefore, the individual *ego* finds himself entangled in this web of life, his only remedy is to become as nearly as possible as though he were not living. Since he has affections and sympathies, loves and hates, desires and repulsions, he must doom these to decay and atrophy by refusing to exercise them. He does not simply say, as the Christian has learned, '*The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal*'; he says, 'The phenomenal is nothing; it is *Mâyâ*, illusion; suffering and pain come out of it, and nothing else. It is the ideal, the world of ideas, that is only worthy; it is undefined and unchangeable,¹ and therefore constitutes supreme happiness and entire freedom; it is the *Âtman*, the real *ego*, a man's real self, and this is identical with the *Brahma*,

¹ 'What is inconstant, is sorrow; what is sorrow, is not-self; what is not-self, that is not mine, that am not I, that is not myself.'—*Samyathaka Nikâya*, vol. ii.

the totality of absolute Existence. The inference follows irresistibly. Let us therefore live in the Ideal and we shall escape the fetters of the Actual. Since the senses are the avenues of sensations which connect the *ego* with the material world, let us close eye to seeing and ear to hearing. Let the affections wither and the man be detached from the material, whatever be its form or embodiment':—

'Whosoever regards things in this light, O monks, being a wise and noble hearer of the word, turns himself from material form, turns himself from sensation and perception, from conformation and consciousness. When he turns therefrom he becomes free from desire; by the cessation of desire he obtains deliverance; in the delivered there arises a consciousness of his deliverance; re-birth is extinct, holiness is completed, duty is accomplished; there is no more a return to this world; he *knows*.'

The process so described is obviously an undoing of the work of birth, a *demanning* himself—that is, a divesting himself of the attributes of the human. On this view it were a degree better, indeed it were the absolutely *best* destiny, not to have been born at all. We hear in it the incarnation of that 'still small voice' so weirdly echoed by the Laureate in his wonderful poem of 'The Two Voices':—

'Thou art so full of misery,
Were it not better not to be?'

A pessimism so thoroughgoing and deadly could hardly, it would seem, take a very general possession of any race in whom the vital forces were strong, or which had any firm hold on life itself. It is the creation of an Oriental race in its weakness and decadence, with the powers of action degenerated, just as Islam is due to another Oriental race, but that one in the fullness of its energy and power. It would be (we may just observe in passing) a task worth the trouble to draw out in detail the contrasts and the similarities of these two typical creations of the religious faculty in two Eastern races.

The doctrine of a metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls, which Gautama adopted into his system, was so far from having originated with him that it is to be found in the Vedic Hymns, which were written in all likelihood as early as B.C. 1500. It was a tenet of the old Persian religion before the time of Zoroaster, and thence found its way into the pages of the Zendavesta. Pythagoras (B.C. 540–510), who was a principal and first disseminator of the doctrine in the West, learned it in Babylon from the Magi. From the same place it reached the Jews during the Babylonian captivity (B.C. 593–

536), and thenceforward it frequently appears in the Rabbinical literature under the title *Gilgula hanneshamoth*. Herodotus (*natus* B.C. 484) speaks of it (ii. 123) as having long been the belief of the Egyptians, and the essential similarity of the Indian and Egyptian doctrine points to the latter having been derived from the former. Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* II. viii. 14) names this tenet as one held in a qualified form by the Pharisees, their *metensomataxis*, however, being of the nature of a reward for such as had lived just and righteous lives; ¹ whereas with the Vedas life on earth is a thing essentially penal, and follows upon a life unworthily led. Plato introduced a new modification of the doctrine in regarding it as remedial (*Phæd.* 248 C.D.E. 249; *Timæus*, 42), so that offending souls were chastened by a sojourn—more or less protracted according to the effect it produced—in the bodies of irrational animals. We are perhaps to see a trace of the working of this belief in the question recorded to have been put to our Lord by His disciples: 'Lord, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?' (*S. John ix. 2*), where a penal character consequent upon some former existence was evidently attributed to the circumstances of the blind man's life.

The doctrine was therefore an older one adopted by Gautama *sub silentio*; but it can hardly be said to blend well with the other features of his system, or even to be tolerably consistent with them. For unquestionably the continued existence of an individual in one life after another implies the immortality of the soul or principle of personality. Now, Buddhism denies both the terms of this affirmation—the subject and the predicate—the *fact* of immortality, and even the existence of the human soul.

In the teaching now extant and ascribed to Gautama Buddha there is no precise and categorical contradiction of the permanence of the *ego*: but on the contrary, he is represented as repeatedly refusing to reply to questions on that point. As thus, for instance:

'The venerable Ānanda, when the wandering monk Vacchagotta had gone to a distance, soon said to the Exalted One: "Wherefore, sire, has the Exalted One not given an answer to the questions put by the wandering monk Vacchagotta?"

'If I, Ānanda, when the wandering monk Vacchagotta asked me, "Is there the Ego?" had answered, "The Ego is," then that, Ānanda, would have confirmed the doctrine of the Samanas and Brahmanas,

¹ 'They say that all souls are incorruptible: that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies, but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment.'

who believe in permanence. If I, Ānanda, when the wandering monk Vacchagotta asked me, "Is there not the Ego?" had answered, "The Ego is not," then that, Ānanda, would have confirmed the doctrine of the Samanas and Brahmanas, who believe in annihilation. If I, Ānanda, when the wandering monk Vacchagotta asked me, "Is there the Ego?" had answered, "The Ego is," would that have served my end, Ānanda, by producing in him the knowledge: all existences (*dhamma*) are Non-Ego?

'That it would not, sire.'

'But if I, Ānanda, when the wandering monk Vacchagotta asked me, "Is there not the Ego?" had answered, 'The Ego is not,' then that, Ānanda, would only have caused the wandering monk Vacchagotta to be thrown from one bewilderment into another: "My Ego, did it not exist before? but now it exists no longer!"'¹

On which Dr. Oldenberg observes with perfect justice, 'If Buddha avoids the negation of the existence of the *ego*, he does so in order not to shock a weakminded hearer.'

Even during his life his disciples went on to draw the inevitable conclusion, 'The *ego* is not; or what is equivalent: The Nirvāna is annihilation.' And speedily this conclusion was reached by other lines of reasoning:

'The cessation of the individual being, the attainment of the everlasting goal presents itself as well to the Brahman as to the Buddhist method of thought and speech as the cessation of "name and form." He who has attained the highest wisdom, unites with the universal spirit, "delivered from name and form, as the streams, the flowing streams, enter into rest in the sea, leaving name and form behind;" thus we read in the "Mundakopanishad." And in the "Suttanipāta" it is said: "What thou hast asked after, Ajita, that will I tell thee; where name and form cease without a residuum: by the cessation of consciousness, there that ceases."'²

This is less surprising, since in other parts of the Buddhist dogmatic the mere existence of a principle of personality is denied. Existence is for the Buddhist, as it were, *impersonal*. There is no soul-substance. All the (apparently) individual is resolved into 'a combination of corporeal form, sensations, perceptions, conformations, and consciousness,' and these are but 'a heap of changeful conformations (Sankhāras),' or in the phrase of Western thought *predicates*, 'a stream of Sankhāras appearing and again vanishing,' which admits of no 'I' and no 'thou,' but only a phenomenon of the 'I' and 'thou' which the many in their hallucination address with an appellation of personality.³

The Buddhist theory of the constituent parts of being is

¹ *Buddha*, p. 273.

² *Ibid.* p. 446.

³ *Ibid.* p. 258.

curious. They are divided into five great groups or *skandhas* : (1) Material qualities ; (2) Sensations ; (3) Ideas ; (4) Predispositions ; (5) Thoughts ; a classification sufficiently crude, and admitting more than one cross-division (unlike in these respects to the Categories of Aristotle, of which it reminds the student). But neither of these is the soul. Gautama himself is said to have thus taught :—

‘O ye monks, in whatever way the different teachers (Samanas and Brahmanas) regard the soul, they think it is the five skandhas, or one of the five. Thus, O ye monks, the unlearned, unconverted man—who does not associate either with the converted or the holy, or understand their law, or live according to it—such a man regards the soul either as identical with, or as possessing, or as containing, or as residing in the material properties (*rūpa*), or as identical with, or as possessing, or as containing, or as residing in sensation (*vedanā*),’ and so on of each of the other three skandhas (ideas, propensities, and mind). ‘By regarding soul in one of the twenty ways, he gets the idea “I am.” Then there are the five organs of sense, and mind, and qualities, and ignorance. From sensation (produced by contact and ignorance) the sensual unlearned man derives the notions “I am,” “This I exists,” “I shall be,” “I shall not be,” “I shall or shall not have material qualities,” “I shall or shall not have, or shall be neither with nor without, ideas.” But now, O ye monks, the learned disciple of the converted, having the same five organs of sense, has got rid of ignorance and acquired wisdom, and therefore (by reason of the absence of ignorance, and the rise of wisdom) the ideas “I am,”’ (&c., as above) ‘do not occur to him.’¹

The ‘heresy of individuality’ (*sakkāyaditthi*) is, in fact, one of the ‘three delusions’ which are declared to be fatal to any progress towards Buddhist sanctity ; the others being belief in the efficacy of rites and ceremonies, and thereby doubt respecting the teaching of the Buddha.

Another of the distinguishing doctrines of Buddhism is that known as *Karma* (destiny, or rather desert), in which may be discerned elements philosophically important, indeed, but, as before, borrowed from older systems.

The doctrine of *karma* is ranked as one of the four great ‘mysteries’ of Buddhism. But the system does not, as we have seen, acknowledge a soul or principle of individuality, and therefore the future existence of the *ego* falls with it. Buddhism professes to have looked through what is usually called the soul, and found there only a bundle of sensations or impulses, which perish with the body. How, then, was it to account for the existence of individual imperfection, indi-

¹ *Buddhism*, p. 94.

vidual suffering, entailed as it were upon the newly-born from his birth? We have already seen, in the reference to S. John's Gospel, how one school of thinkers in one nation attempted to account for it. Buddhism takes in the doctrine of *karma* a somewhat different view. It is this: that *karma* is the sum, the total moral effect and result of all a man's actions, words, and wishes during the whole of this life. When, then, any sentient being, whether human or angelic, dies, a new being is at once born into a state of existence more or less elevated and happy than the last, according to the total fitness and desert of the being whose life has been completed. Thus the new being, though not identical with the former one, enters into the inheritance of his merits or demerits; and in this way Buddhism endeavours to supply a link of moral causation for congenital or hereditary sufferings.

'What we are, is the fruit of that which we have done. As an acquisition of pre-Buddhist speculation we have already come across the proposition, "Whatsoever he does, to a corresponding state he attains;" and Buddhism teaches: "My action is my possession; my action is my inheritance; my action is the womb which bears me. My action is the race to which I am akin; my action is my refuge." What appears to man to be his body, is in truth "the action of his past state, which then assuming a form, realizing through his endeavour, has become endowed with a tangible existence." The law of causality, substantially regarded by Buddhist speculation as a natural law, here assumes the form of a moral power influencing the universe. No man can escape the effect of his actions. "Not in the heavens," it is said in the Dhammapada, "not in the midst of the sea, not if thou hidest thyself away in the clefts of the mountains, wilt thou find a place on earth where thou canst escape the fruit of thy evil actions." "Him who has been long travelling, and who returns home in safety, the welcome of relatives, friends, and acquaintances, awaits. So him who has done good works, when he passes over from this world into the hereafter, his good works welcome, like relatives a home-returning friend."¹

Notwithstanding, therefore, its denial of any persistence of individuality after this life, it claims to find the link of necessary *nexus* between the cause (past action) and the effect (re-birth) in '*that which alone remains*,' says Dr. Rhys Davids, 'when a man dies, and the constituent parts of the sentient being are dissolved: in the result, namely, of his actions, speech, and thought, in his good or evil *karma* (literally his "doing"), which *does not die*.' And since it is certain that 'whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap' (Gal. vi. 7, 8), as we learn from that noble saying of S. Paul, it may seem the easier

¹ *Buddha*, p. 243.

to infer, as is done in this doctrine, that *whatsoever a man reaps, he must also have formerly sown*. But the inference is obviously a breach of a very familiar rule of logic that 'if you affirm the consequent, or deny the antecedent, you can infer nothing; for the same consequent may follow from other antecedents.

The foregoing brief sketch of the most important doctrines of Buddhism may serve to exhibit the great dogmatic outlines on which it was first reared by its founder, unquestionably a great thinker, and a man of marvellous intellectual gifts; and with which also his Indian followers are, for the most part, to this day contented.

During the present generation, however, a quickening has thrilled through the dry bones of this ancient faith. Whether the impulse was self-originated, or communicated from without, does not appear clear; but probably it was the latter. The neighbourhood of Western culture has stirred even the immobility of the Buddhist monks in their gloomy cloisters of immemorial quiet. They have begun to study, to translate into the vernacular, even to *print*, their sacred books. The close and appreciative attention given to these latter by distinguished European scholars cannot but have reacted upon their original possessors. The list of works given at the head of this article, and a much longer one which might be gathered from Professor Oldenberg's works, show with what minuteness these texts have been studied. It has found a few converts from among Christians; and, astonishing as the fact is, even a priest of the Church of England has, shortly after reaching Ceylon, gone through some form (probably but half understood, or not understood at all, as the ceremony would be in Páli) of adherence to the sect.¹

¹ We quote from an Indian newspaper :—"A Christian minister sitting at the feet of the yellow-robed priests of Buddha, and solemnly repeating after them—"I take my refuge in Buddha! I take my refuge in the law! I take my refuge in the order!" The *Pansil* ceremony was administered by the High Priest, the Rev. H. Sumangala, Principal of the Vidyodaya College at Colombo, who was assisted by the Rev. T. Amaramoli, a Buddhist priest, both of whom recited the *Pirit* (blessings) used on such occasions. Among those present were Col. Olcott, Madame Blavatsky, and a number of passengers from the *Navarino*, by which Mr. Leadbeater had arrived, and many prominent native citizens of Ceylon. On being requested by the High Priest to state his reasons why he desired to be a follower of Lord Buddha, Mr. Leadbeater stated that it was his desire to arrive at the truth expressed in a purer form in Buddhism than in any other system with which he was acquainted. He further stated that while the Christian doctrines were all based upon hearsay evidence and upon doubtful authority, and required him to believe many unreasonable things, the teaching of Gautama Buddha,

The most marked sign, however, of the growth of this Neo-Buddhism, is the activity and rapid extension of what is known as the 'Theosophical Society.' This association was founded in the United States in November, 1875, by Colonel Olcott, a gentleman whose name has been prominently before the public for some time in connexion with the propaganda of Theosophy.¹ Its avowed purpose, besides forming 'the nucleus of a universal brotherhood of humanity without distinction of race, creed, or colour,' and promoting 'the study of Aryan and other Eastern literature, religions, and sciences,' is, thirdly, 'to investigate unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers of man'—a vast and undefined object, which may cover many things, and in particular does cover, as we gather from the works of its members and supporters, the gaining credence for and adherents to a vast theurgic and magical system, to which we must presently advert. We learn from its latest Report, which lies before us, that up to the end of January 1885, it had no less than 108 Branches: ninety-four in Asia; seven in Europe, including Branches in London, Edinburgh, Nice, and Paris; six in North America, including the West Indies; and one in Australasia. The treasurer's account for the year acknowledges receipts of 26,575 rupees. We do not find any list of members or summary of their number, in the Report, but it is evident from the proceedings at the annual meeting that the number is considerable. We have taken the trouble to read through all the Reports sent in by the Branches, and we find that some devote themselves to the practice of spiritualism and 'psychical research,' very many to mesmerism, psychopathy, and animal magnetism, while the President himself announces it as 'one of the most important of my projects to effect a revival of pure exoteric Buddhism, and a union of Buddhist nations for this purpose.'

which stands forth most prominently, is that we should believe nothing which our reason cannot accept as true, because faith, to be lasting, must be based upon sound reason and common sense.' Of course there are inaccuracies in the above account. Buddhism has no priests 'yellow-robed' or otherwise; it is the monks who are meant. The unhappy man who is the subject of the narrative appears not to be a graduate, nor can we trace any sort of preparation that he can have had for Holy Orders. It may therefore be the less strange that coming into contact with perhaps the most elevated and moral form which heathenism assumes, without adequate intellectual training or habit of comparing the strong and weak points of novel systems of belief, he should have been led into an action so much to be deplored. We cannot but think that, on reflection, he will retrace his steps.

¹ Colonel Olcott, we learn from the Indian newspapers, publicly

THE
jects
avowed
dhism,
as a Fa
seen, w
¹ Ra
² Pe
VOL.

Notwithstanding this very plain statement, it does not appear to us that Theosophy has any very real or close connexion with Buddhism, or that its chief representatives feel any great enthusiasm for the latter. The really attractive element in Theosophy is 'Occultism.' We cannot but agree with the German branch that it 'has always been identified here with *mysticism*, by which, in fact, Theosophy is surrounded in India and also in England even now. It has been largely supported there by magical phenomena and references to occultism.'¹

The further inquiry is naturally suggested, What is Occultism?

Occultism, then, claims to be the revival of the ancient mysteries: we say *revival*, but it is contended that the occult science was already a complete system of knowledge that had been 'cultivated in secret and handed down to its initiates for ages,'² long before the mysteries, Hermetic, Orphic, or Eleusinian, had begun to be performed. And since all these initiates (it is said) were members of societies, which societies were all affiliated to each other, and lasted on generation after generation, in every age of the world's history, it would be very possible (assuming this to be true) that the accumulated knowledge of many generations of these men might equal, and even surpass, the achievements of modern science, which is at best the work of but a few generations. And that is, in fact, the claim that is made on their behalf.

'Thus, by means of various secret associations, Occultism appears to have been handed down from the times of the Mysteries to our own days. The only Brotherhood at present mentioned in the outer world is one which extends its branches throughout the East, and of which the headquarters are reported to be in Thibet. It is open to any person who can prove himself fit for membership, but the neophyte, or Chela, must undergo a discipline of many years, and pass through terrible ordeals, before he can be completely initiated. These trials, it is affirmed, are neither arranged by caprice, nor designed to support a jealous exclusiveness, but are necessary to the pupil himself, to prepare him for the tremendous revelation which will at last reward his successful perseverance.'³

The chief authority apparently on these mysterious subjects is Mr. A. P. Sinnett, a member of the Indian Civil Service, who avowed himself a Buddhist some few months ago. But he regards Buddhism, we learn (since the earlier pages of this article were written), 'not as a Faith, but as a Philosophy,' in which view, as our readers will have seen, we so far agree with him.

¹ *Report*, p. 69.

² A. P. Sinnett, *The Occult World*, p. 3.

³ Pember, *Earth's Earliest Ages*, p. 400.

Service, who has written the two books named at the head of this article professedly to adapt Occultism to Western modes of thought. He claims to have been entrusted with a mission to do this from the chiefs or 'adepts' of this occult association, of whom we have presently to speak. This gentleman asserts that 'it is chiefly in the East that Occultism is still kept up, in India and in adjacent countries,' while with regard to their actual knowledge he declares that 'they inherit from their great predecessors a science which deals not merely with physics, but with the constitution and capacities of the human soul and spirit. Modern science has discovered the circulation of the blood; occult science understands the circulation of the life-principle. Modern physiology deals with the body only; occultism with the soul as well.'¹

The masters or adepts who are asserted to be the present depositaries of these stupendous powers are called *Mahatmas* (brothers) or *Arhats*. They are not, however, accessible to the general mass of mankind, or even at all times to their disciples or followers. A veil of mystery is flung over their places of abode, their powers, occupations, and modes of communication with the few persons (*chelas*, that is, disciples) who are to some extent in their confidence. Their existence is assumed to be demonstrated by their transmission of letters to and fro by other means than the ordinary post; by the showering of notes, roses, and such like, upon people's heads at unexpected times; the placing of answers to letters in places apparently inaccessible by ordinary means, and similar exploits: for the most part showing (as it strikes us) a marked degree of eccentricity of character, and a want of that intellectual gravity which the possession of great knowledge and exalted powers might be supposed to impart. Let us give an example, in which Mr. Sinnett declares that he is relating his own experience:—

'I have repeatedly heard Madame Blavatsky called in this way, when our own little party being alone some evening we have all been quietly reading. A little "ting" would suddenly sound, and Madame Blavatsky would get up and go to her room to attend to whatever occult business may have been the motive of her summons. A very pretty illustration of the sound, as thus produced by some brother-initiate at a distance, was afforded one evening under these circumstances. A lady, a guest at another house at Simla, had been dining with us, when about eleven o'clock I received a note from her host, enclosing a letter which he asked me to get Madame Blavatsky to send on by occult means to a certain member of the

¹ *The Occult World*, p. 3.

great fraternity, to whom both he and I had been writing. I shall explain the circumstances of this correspondence more fully later on. We were all anxious to know at once—before the lady with us that evening returned up the hill, so that she could take back word to her host—whether the letter could be sent; but Madame Blavatsky declared that her own powers would not enable her to perform the feat. The question was whether a certain person, a half-developed brother then in the neighbourhood of Simla, would give the necessary help. Madame Blavatsky said she would see if she could “find him,” and taking the letter in her hands, she went out into the verandah, where we all followed her. Leaning on the balustrade, and looking over the wide sweep of the Simla valley, she remained for a few minutes perfectly motionless and silent, as we all were; and the night was far enough advanced for all common-place sounds to have settled down, so that the stillness was perfect. Suddenly, in the air before us, there sounded the clear note of an occult-bell. “All right,” cried Madame, “he will take it.” And duly taken the letter was shortly afterwards.¹

This lady, Madame Blavatsky, who is here introduced to the reader by Mr. Sinnett as possessed of and exercising such remarkable powers, is, we are told (in another place), ‘a Russian gentlewoman, grand-daughter of Princess Dolgorouki, of the elder branch, and widow of General N. V. Blavatsky, governor during the Crimean War and for many years of Erivan, in Armenia. This lady, after devoting herself to occult pursuits for some thirty years, repaired to a Himalayan retreat, where she spent seven years under the immediate direction of the Brothers, and was initiated and instructed for her mission.’ She was then dismissed to the outer world, where she has been advocating occultism in various countries, but principally in India and the East, ever since, by such displays of her peculiar powers as that narrated above, mostly, if not invariably, in the private houses of her friends and acquaintances. If the reports of these ladies and gentlemen are to be accepted simply as facts, there can be no doubt that she is able to do a variety of strange things. But the question at once arises, Were they deceived or not? Were the so-called ‘phenomena’ genuine results of the exercise of abnormal powers, or were they due simply to clever conjuring? And it is precisely this issue which is raised in the harshest and most unmistakable form, by the publication of a series of letters in the *Christian College Magazine* for September and October 1884, purporting to be from Madame B. to a certain Madame Coulomb, a confidential agent who had been, with her husband, resident for some considerable time at the ‘head-quarters’ of the Theosophical Society at Adyar, Madras, and, as she asserts,

¹ *The Occult World*, p. 41.

the confederate of Madame Blavatsky in the production of many of these phenomena. These letters, whatever judgment may be ultimately formed respecting them, cannot possibly be ignored in any critical examination of the occult question. The members of the Theosophical Society, indeed, protest that they 'do not attach much importance to the phenomena.' But it is unquestionable that the whole movement will be morally discredited if found to have been based on, or at all events supported by, fraud and trickery. Under these circumstances, it may be a matter of surprise that the Committee of the Theosophical Society should report against the sifting of the matter in a court of law. Nor does the alleged shrinking from giving 'the world the spectacle of a spiteful cross-examination' (*Report*, p. 104) tend at all to mend matters. But it is not our business to decide the point; nor, indeed—although we have read with the greatest care not only Madame Coulomb's *Account of my Intercourse with Madame Blavatsky*, and Mr. Gribble's *Report of an Examination into the Blavatsky Correspondence*, which pronounces for the genuineness of the letters, which two documents may be regarded, we imagine, as the case for the prosecution, but also (on the other side) Dr. Hartmann's *Observations*, the Theosophical Society Committee's 'Report,' and the other publications on this subject—do we feel capable of doing so. The 'Report' we mentioned just now of the Committee appointed by the General Council of the Theosophical Society¹ on 'The Result of an Investigation' contains a detailed criticism by Madame Blavatsky herself upon the letters, partly admitting, partly denying them. But where the conflict of evidence is so great as it is here, we have no means of deciding which is right, and, indeed, no great interest in so doing. The so-called 'Occult Phenomena' are in no sense and in no point of view the *σημεία μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα* which have weight to authenticate a new Evangel: indeed, the general character is such as to arouse impatience rather than awe, and ridicule in place of wonder. It is difficult to linger gravely over the details of a picnic party, and the wonderful (!) event described at much length which took place there, and which we are invited to regard as 'a most wonderful display of a power of which the modern scientific world has no comprehension whatever':—

¹ We suppose it would be hardly fair to call it a 'packed' one, but yet it seems to have consisted entirely of thoroughgoing partizans of Madame Blavatsky, without one outsider or independent critic.

'We set out at the appointed time next morning. We were originally to have been a party of six, but a seventh person joined us just before we started. After going down the hill for some hours, a place was chosen in the wood near the upper waterfall for our breakfast; the baskets that had been brought with us were unpacked, and, as usual at an Indian picnic, the servants at a little distance lighted a fire, and set to work to make tea and coffee. Concerning this, some joking arose over the fact that we had one cup and saucer too few, and some one laughingly asked Madame Blavatsky to create another cup and saucer. There was no set purpose in the proposal at first, but when Madame Blavatsky said it would be very difficult, but that if we liked she would try, attention was of course at once arrested. Madame Blavatsky, as usual, held mental conversation with one of the Brothers, and then wandered a little about in the immediate neighbourhood of where we were sitting—that is to say, within a radius of half a dozen to a dozen yards from our picnic cloth—I closely following, waiting to see what would happen. Then she marked a spot on the ground, and called to one of the gentlemen of the party to bring a knife to dig with. The place chosen was the edge of a little slope covered with thick weeds and grass and shrubby undergrowth. The gentleman with the knife—let us call him X—as I shall have to refer to him afterwards—tore up these in the first place with some difficulty, as the roots were tough and closely interlaced. Cutting then into the matted roots and earth with the knife, and pulling away the *débris* with his hands, he came at last on the edge of something white, which turned out, as it was completely excavated, to be the required cup. A corresponding saucer was also found after a little more digging. Both objects were in among the roots, which spread everywhere through the ground, so that it seemed as if the roots were growing round them. The cup and saucer both corresponded exactly, as regards their pattern, with those that had been brought to the picnic, and constituted a seventh cup and saucer when brought back to where we were to have breakfast. I may as well add at once that afterwards, when we got home, my wife questioned our principal khitmutgar, as to how many cups and saucers of that particular kind we possessed. In the progress of years, as the set was an old set, some had been broken, but the man at once said that nine teacups were left. When collected and counted that number was found to be right, without reckoning the excavated cup. That made ten, and as regards the pattern, it was one of a somewhat peculiar kind, bought a good many years previously in London, and which assuredly could never have been matched in Simla.¹

Yet this is the episode of 'the Simla Cup' which we are told has 'become historical.' We cannot say that we feel greatly impressed either with what Mr. Sinnett calls 'the celebrated brooch incident,' and the impression we have when we are

¹ *The Occult World*, p. 47.

told of a shower of cut roses falling on the heads of the writer and his friends when sitting at dinner in the hall of a house lent them by a native prince, is merely that of the busy hands of some 'tricksy Puck,' human in all probability, and not at all that of a wonder-working sage. Mr. Sinnett, indeed, did, it would seem, on one occasion propose a test which, far from having the fanciful and foolish character of most of the 'phenomena,' was grave, sensible, and businesslike, and would, we are free to allow, have proved 'the possibility of obtaining by occult agency physical results which were beyond the control of ordinary science': that is, in his own words, 'the production in our presence in India (Simla) of a copy of the London *Times* of that day's date' (*Occult World*, p. 64)—but then, *he was refused*: and among all the cloud of pseudo-wonders, nothing of that kind has ever been done, so far as we know; though certainly such a result would be of a perfectly *natural* kind, and one that human science and commercial enterprise may conceivably hope some day to see realized. So, then, it would seem that any number of petty wonders may be performed by the skill or power of the occultists, but nothing serious or important, nothing unmistakably a 'work of power,' that should bear adequate witness to the science and mastery which had brought it to pass. 'Precisely because the test of the London newspaper would close the mouths of the sceptics,' we are told that 'Koot Hoomi' wrote to his admiring disciple, it was inadmissible. But wherefore, most grave and reverend Signior? Why provoke and feed public curiosity, and yet refuse to satisfy it? Refuse altogether, or yield altogether—either course is intelligible and may be right. But the middle course, to make high pretensions, and claim vast powers, while behaving at all times and places like the 'tricksy fiend' at the pantomime of a country fair, does not impress us with admiration of the elevating influences which occult studies have had, we are told, upon the minds of the 'adepts', or even show their possession of ordinary common sense. Some have doubted, we believe, whether the so-called Mahatmas or 'Masters,' and particularly the gentleman who rejoices in the euphonious name of 'Koot Hoomi,' had any real existence at all, and have thought them rather *voces et præterea nihil*, put forward by the leaders of the movement to cover and give greatness to their own indistinguished personalities. Whatever be the case with other occult names that have been mentioned, we at least do not doubt, from the perusal of the various letters and communications purporting to have come from him, that there

is *somebody* masquerading behind that name, and that somebody is not Madame Blavatsky. The name is Eastern, and the sustained character that of a Tibetan Brother; but the style is emphatically Western, and the staple of the thinking, the incidental allusions, the whole mental background of the writer, are unmistakably symptomatic of a superficial European education, in which he has skimmed over the surface of many subjects without really exhausting any. In fact, much of what is given us as from his pen is but the ordinary 'fine writing' of the Bengali Babu; and the assumption of the lofty phrases of a 'veiled prophet' is simply an elaborate hoax. He writes his English with Scotch (or American) idioms, as we have noticed in various places. Take as example of this unintentional self-betrayal the letter given in *The Occult World*, pp. 66, 67. The writer quotes Dr. Hooke's *Micrographia*, and not only misspells the writer's name as *Hookes* but misstates the cause and nature of his dispute with Newton. It is absurd enough to find him commenting upon Lord Lytton's romance of *The Coming Race* as if it were a record of actual facts, and asserting that 'the Church sought to sacrifice Galileo as a *holocaust* to the Bible,' which is, historically speaking, sheer nonsense. And it would be a curious English school in which *Roma ante Romulum fuit* was 'taught us,' as Koot Hoomi says, as 'an axiom.' Perhaps it was a dim reminiscence of *Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona* that he had in his mind, and he ought to know his English better (not to speak of the Greek word itself) than to talk of 'an impossibility, a myth,' as if they meant the same thing. We hardly like to venture to instruct a 'Mahatma,' but perhaps his Greatness (or whatever the proper style of address may be) will pardon us for remarking that a myth is not an impossibility, nor yet a truth regarded as fabulous (which is the sense in which he uses it), but a fabulous story which in the process of time has come to be regarded as true.

But here we must make our bow to Koot Hoomi.

It seems upon the whole, that we are led to the following dilemma: Either this new departure of Neo-Buddhism is sheer imposture: its teaching wild and incoherent speculation, and the pretensions of its leaders to vast powers simply preposterous. That is one alternative. Or, again, it may be seriously intended and propounded in good faith. That would be the other alternative. In that case the nature of its subject matter would make it necessarily of a religious or scientific character. But if scientific, it would be logical, intelligible, and natural, and its views would agree with what is

already known of the laws of nature. It would not need to recommend itself by petty and puzzling magic of a commonplace kind, which, though we cannot profess to explain, we vehemently suspect; and above all it would not be *secret*. True science throws processes and results alike as open as the day, to all who would share them. But of this movement, the objects, teachers, and methods, are alike shrouded in the deepest darkness.

Perhaps, however, it is, or professes to be, religious?

The reader who has gone with us through this survey of the system, will be under no illusion in that respect. For we have seen that the Old Buddhism, if it be to be considered as a religion at all, contains perhaps more erroneous ideas than have ever been combined in any single system. It is at once atheistic and fatalist, thus subjecting all things to the grinding and multiplied injustices of a blind Necessity, instead of conceiving them as guided by an Intelligent Will. With theism falls the idea of a Moral Law binding upon man, and even the distinction between good and evil, which has its ultimate ground in the Will of God. Finally, it denies to man a soul and a future conscious existence. According to it the human race are just ephemera and no more: worms of earth, crawling for a brief moment in their slime, and then ceasing to be.

‘Quum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter
Unguibus et pugnīs, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant armīs.’

When mankind wholly despairs of itself and its destinies, it may take up generally with some such system of blank atheism and gloomy pessimism as this; but, as it seems to us, not until then.

‘Hope springs eternal in the human breast,’

while Buddhism originally emerged from a race of men driven to despair; it is despair organized and reduced to a system. But as darkness is chased by light, so despair cannot coexist with hope. It is, like Calvinism, a fore-doomed creed.

Startling news has been reported in the Indian journals respecting the collapse—partly actual, partly impending—of the Theosophical movement. We mentioned that the Committee of the Theosophical Society had advised Madame Blavatsky not to prosecute—a proceeding quite incomprehensible, unless on the supposition that the inculcated letters were more or less genuine. But the effect of it

was that Madame Coulomb, who had published them, was deprived of any opportunity of vindicating herself against charges freely lavished against her of having forged some or all of the letters. This being the case, 'I determined therefore,' she says (we quote from the *Indian Churchman* of Calcutta, date May 30), 'to bring the question of the genuineness of the letters before a court of law by my own action. I was advised that this could be done by prosecuting any of those Theosophists who had charged me with forging them. . . . I therefore instructed Messrs. Barclay and Morgan to proceed against General Morgan, of Ootacamund, as he had been the most forward in charging me with crime.' Immediately upon this being done (one week later) Madame Blavatsky, who would have been one of the two principal witnesses in the case, left India and sailed for Europe. Madame Coulomb, indeed, asserts that 'the chief men of the Society, when things became serious and there was a probability of prosecution, insisted upon her breaking her connexion with the Society and leaving the country at once.' That, however, must be taken at present as a mere *ex parte* statement from one of the parties, however closely it may accord with the probabilities of the case. Whatever, however, is apparently certain is that the elaborate 'Report' of the Theosophical Society issued in defence of Madame B. *has now been withdrawn*, 'containing, as Mr. R. Ragoonath Row admits, "untruths and non-genuine documents," the work of unscrupulous friends of Madame B.' (*J. C.* May 30.)

'In the May number of the *Theosophist* also there is a special circular addressed by Colonel Olcott to the presidents of all branch Theosophical Societies, in which he repudiates *all connexion of the Theosophical movement with occult phenomena*.'

All this is in the highest degree significant, and we cannot but be glad to see our own judgment of the true character of 'occultism' thus speedily verified, and weaker brethren delivered from the glamour of a dangerous delusion.

ART. IV.—FREMANTLE'S BAMPTON LECTURES.

The World as the Subject of Redemption; being an Attempt to set forth the Functions of the Church, as designed to embrace the whole Race of Mankind. Bampton Lectures (1883). By the Hon. and Rev. W. H. FREMANTLE, M.A., Canon of Canterbury and Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. (London, 1885.)

IT is in no way surprising that the minds of many people at the present day are largely occupied with the social and political aspects of Christianity. Religion belongs to the

deepest part of man's nature, and it cannot but affect everything which concerns him. In a scientific age the relations between religion and science naturally attract attention. In an age of great social and political change the attitude which the Christian ought to adopt towards the movements going on around him becomes a question of pressing importance.

There are some who would have us stand aloof from all that is not immediately and directly concerned in the development of the individual spiritual life. The world, they tell us, is very evil. It must be left to go on in its own mad, bad way. The Christian cannot hope to improve the world as such. All he can do is to separate himself from it, to come out of it, and to induce as many others as possible to follow his example. We had better not meddle with the affairs of the world at all, they say, unless it be by way of occasional protest.

Others urge with greater truth that we ought to take a more hopeful view of the possible future of human society, and a more generous view of the duty of Christians with regard to it. The existing condition of the social organism is indeed bad, but it is capable of being made better, and it is the mission of Christianity to transform it. And in that case Christians have no right to assume a position of selfish isolation from the world. They should rather claim the world for Christ, and boldly endeavour to win it for Him. The ideal which we set before us, the goal towards which we press, should be nothing less than the triumph of the Christian faith, not in one department only of human life, but in all. We are bidden in Holy Scripture to look forward to a time when 'the kingdom of the world' shall have 'become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.' We should be trying, surely, to hasten the coming of that time. We should be doing all that lies in our power to bring about submission to our Master's rule, not only in the case of individuals, but on the part of society at large.

The Bampton Lectures for 1883 are intended to develop this thought. Their purpose, as stated at the outset, is 'to restore the idea of the Christian Church as a moral and social power, present, universal, capable of transforming the whole life of mankind, and destined to accomplish this transformation.' It is certainly true, as the lecturer complains, that Christian teachers, in their concern for individuals, have too often overlooked the need and the possibility of improving the social organization of which they form part. Important spheres of Christian duty have consequently been neglected.

Many of the most serious interests of life have been regarded 'as secular and profane,' and Christian influence has not been brought to bear upon them as it should have been. Thus the Church has come to be looked upon (rightly or wrongly) rather as the opponent than the leader of movements of social and political reform. We may believe, indeed, that this reproach is being gradually removed. Our people are learning to put themselves at the head of good works for necessary uses. But there is still much to be done in awakening the consciences of Christian men and women to their responsibilities in such matters. The glaring contrast between excessive luxury on the one hand and squalid poverty on the other; the growing consciousness of this contrast on the part of those who suffer under it, and the increasing discontent among the poorer classes; the misery caused by the fluctuations of trade, the loathsome evils of overcrowding, the defects in our system of technical education; these and subjects like these, as bearing directly on the well-being of our brother men, are subjects in which the Church ought not merely to show an interest, but in dealing with which she ought to be prepared to teach and to guide.

And as in social, so in political affairs; the coming democracy, with its grave dangers and its great possibilities of good; our system of party government, with its practical advantages and its moral defects, its blind animosities and equally blind allegiances, our war parties and peace parties, our international enmities and questionable international morality: all these are subjects on which the influence of the Christian Church ought to be exerted and ought to make itself felt. Canon Fremantle is right when he urges that the ideal of a Christian State is not one in which secular and spiritual affairs are regarded as wholly disconnected. In such an ideal community, as he points out, the Church and the State would be conterminous, for each would embrace the whole. The temporal rulers would know themselves to be indeed 'God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing,' and the prayer of our Good Friday Collect would be, to some extent at least, realized, and not one class alone, not clergy more than laity, but all estates of men in God's Holy Church, and every member of the same in his vocation and ministry, would endeavour truly and godly to serve Him Who is the Lord of all.

Canon Fremantle has traced in his fourth and fifth lectures some of the efforts which have been made towards the practical realization of such an ideal of a Christian State. He has

much that is interesting and suggestive to say of these attempts, whether directed to the organization of Christendom as a whole, as under Constantine, or in the time of the mediæval empire, or to the formation on a smaller scale of a purely Christian community, as in the case of Savonarola, or Calvin, or the Scottish Covenanters, or the first Puritan settlers in New England. The fact that these efforts have failed need not make us despair. At least we may hope to make progress in the direction of the ideal. We may realize some of its features, if not all. We may help to conquer some little corner of the kingdom of this world for Him Whose right it is to rule it all.

So far as what has been said expresses the aim and scope of Canon Fremantle's book, we are in hearty and complete accord with him. And we are anxious to state this clearly and frankly at the outset because, when we turn from general statements of the object in view to detailed discussion of what is implied in it, and how it is to be achieved, we find it impossible to regard these lectures as offering any serious contribution to the subject. The least adverse criticism which can be made upon them is that they are wholly and hopelessly unpractical. Canon Fremantle has apparently no idea, for instance, that any serious difficulty would arise under present circumstances in an attempt to carry out at once in England this ideal of a Christian State. 'The English nation,' he says, 'has never recognized any Church of England but itself. It has recognized various functions within the Church; and it has established as corporations sole or aggregate the responsible ministers of public worship, while giving . . . full liberty of worship to all its members.'¹ Unhappily, however, as we all know, the persons constituting the English nation have divided themselves into various sects and religious societies, and a very large proportion of them entirely decline to recognize the authority of the responsible ministers in question. It would be possible, as Canon Fremantle sees, for the nation to abandon the present system altogether, and leave 'the organization for public worship' to 'the conduct of private associations.'² This, however, would not, he thinks, conform to the idea of a Christian State. 'If the nation acknowledges itself to be a Church, it can hardly do otherwise than have its own system of worship, *maintaining its parochial character, and giving it such reforms as will make it minister to the national wants.*'³ So far as we understand the meaning

¹ P. 336.² P. 337.³ Pp. 337, 338. The italics in this and the subsequent quotations are, with unimportant exceptions, ours.

of this proposal, considered as a practical suggestion, it amounts to this: The State is not to disestablish what ordinary people call the Church of England, and let it go on in its own way side by side with the various sects, but is to retain the Establishment, and solve all difficulties by depriving the Church of England of every distinctive characteristic. The Church is to be so 'reformed' that Baptists, Independents, Quakers, Peculiar People, and Latter-Day Saints would all feel equally at home within its capacious borders. It does not seem to have occurred to the lecturer that anyone could or would object to this process of reform, or that any insuperable obstacles of a practical kind would arise in the attempt to carry it out.

There is a delightful *naïveté*, too, in the appeal which Canon Fremantle makes to the students of physical science. Full justice is now done, he remarks, to their own claims. 'Even those engaged in the engrossing work of religion and philanthropy feel increasingly bound not to contravene the proper boundaries of exact science.' But, sad to relate, this respect for boundaries is not reciprocal.

'The students of the exact sciences are very apt to press forward without due regard to the relative proportion and value of the various branches of knowledge. It must be the aim of the Church to reassert the true proportion. The pursuit of Natural Science is indeed so pure and noble, so vast and so fruitful in results, that it is easy to understand how one immersed in it may fancy himself dispensed from taking notice of the moral and political world around him, *or of the system of public worship*. Yet such an attitude is by no means a noble one. Rather it is selfish, in the sense that it ignores all but its own province. When it is felt that knowledge constitutes among those who pursue it a genuine branch of the Church, and when it is cultivated from Christian motives, it may be hoped that the votaries of the natural sciences will accept more fully the need of harmonizing their own province with those of others. . . . When this takes place, the single cloud will have disappeared which still hangs over the triumphs of knowledge, and its pursuit will go on with mutual confidence and at an accelerated pace.'¹

Canon Fremantle is apparently unaware that any 'students of the exact sciences' have so far taken notice of the system of public worship as to have come to the conclusion that it is not founded upon truth. How the cloud of which he speaks as hanging over the triumphs of knowledge is to be removed without a contrary conviction being first produced in their minds he has not felt himself called upon to explain.

¹ Pp. 342, 343.

So with regard to international difficulties, Canon Fremantle remarks that,

'If France and Germany could agree to leave the question of Alsace-Lorraine to arbitration, allowing it to be appropriated to one or the other, to be divided, or to be neutralized under an European guarantee, as might appear best to the arbitrators, the only ground of quarrel remaining in Western Europe would be removed.'¹

We need scarcely say that we quite agree with this, and think it would be very nice. But—we know it is very wrong of us—we cannot help smiling at the thought of what Prince Bismarck would be likely to say if such a proposal were made to him.

The fact is that those who are most anxious to see Christian principles brought to bear upon social and political questions are also in many cases most in doubt as to the best means of effecting their object. They do not discern clearly, for instance, what ought to be done with regard to the problems which the Socialists are trying in one fashion to solve. They wish to use their influence, whatever it may be, on the side of right and justice, and for the permanent well-being of all classes of the community. They long to help in raising the poor out of squalor and wretchedness. They long to join in protesting against every unfair and oppressive inequality. But they do not see their way. The methods proposed by those who are agitating on the subject do not seem to them to be the right methods. And in fear lest they should do more harm than good, they stand aside and do nothing. Anything that would help such persons to take wise action would be most useful. Anyone who would point out clearly and convincingly the next step which the Church ought to take in regard to social questions would be doing her a real service. But on all such really practical matters Canon Fremantle gives us no guidance.

The book, however, has a much more serious defect than that of leading to no definite result. It is pervaded throughout by a view of Christianity which, to say the least, is wholly inadequate and unsatisfactory. There is an element of truth in it, but as presented by Canon Fremantle it has the character of a half-truth, and, like all half-truths, it is objectionable, not in consequence of what it asserts, but of what it implicitly denies.

The subject of the lectures is, 'The World as the Subject of Redemption,' and they are described as 'an attempt to set forth the functions of the Church as designed to embrace the

¹ P. 356.

whole race of mankind.' It is important to ascertain at the outset the sense in which the leading terms are employed by the lecturer. The 'world,' he tells us, is to be changed into the 'Church,' and so 'saved' or 'redeemed.' 'We mean by the world the organized constitution of things in which we live, including the material universe so far as we apprehend it, but chiefly humanity, which (taking the world as known to us) is its crown.'¹ The world in its true and normal condition is a harmony, but this harmony is broken up when man fails to take his rightful position, and to use nature and his fellow-men in obedience to the moral law.

'The harmony is restored when the spiritual aim is understood and embraced. Then men are at one through their common pursuit of justice and love, and outer nature is subservient to this pursuit. This harmony is also properly divine; the world thus conceived is a manifestation of God. He who perceives and acts upon this harmony is a believer in God, whether he name the sacred name or not. He who through moral indifference does not recognize it, at least as "the purpose of the ages," and he alone, may properly be called an atheist. But he who with mind and heart embraces this harmony, embraces the thought and purpose of God Himself. We may say more. Since God dwells in the world as thus conceived, since He is the justice and the love which give it its character, he who thus conceives it takes in the divine nature, or rather is taken into it, and he thus becomes an agent of God's will and of His purpose—a member and a minister of Him who fills all in all.'²

It would appear, then, that in Canon Fremantle's view, a 'member of Christ' simply means one who conceives of the world as harmonized by a moral order. The difficulty of such a conception lies in the fact that the harmony has been broken through. This, however, we are told, is an unreal and transitional stage in the world's development.

'When the world is under the dominion of selfishness then it becomes an evil thing. As such it is constantly spoken of in Scripture, where sometimes the unreal and transitional character of this stage is marked by the expression "*This world*." "*The Prince of this world cometh*;"³ "the rulers of the darkness of *this world*;"⁴ and the word αἰών rather than κόσμος is used to denote this transitional state.'⁵

In support of this statement, a note is added in the Appendix headed 'Passages in which αἰών is used rather than

¹ P. 4.² Pp. 4, 5.³ S. John xiv. 30.⁴ Eph. vi. 12. It so happens that in neither of the passages quoted does the expression 'this world' occur, according to the true reading.⁵ P. 5.

κόσμος to designate this World.' Six such passages only are given; the remainder of the note we must quote in full:—

'The normal use of κόσμος, on the other hand, is to be seen in such expressions as Ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Matt. xiii. 35, Eph. i. 4.

'The contrast in the Parable of the Tares between κόσμος, "the field is the world," and αἰών, "the end of the world or age," that is, of the present dispensation, is specially instructive, and it is to be lamented that it was not found possible to express this contrast in the revised version.

'In St. John, though κόσμος is used to express both the world as organized according to God's purpose, or in a neutral sense, and also the world as organized for selfish and evil purposes, the latter sense is commonly marked by the addition of *this*, as Ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κ. τούτου.

'Passages in which κόσμος is used for the world in its present evil state:—

'John xvii. 16, Ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσὶ καθὼς ἐγὼ κ. τ. λ.

'" xvi. 33, Ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον.

'But the sense varies in the same passage, as xiv. 30, 31, Ἐρχεται ὁ τοῦ κ. ἄρχων . . . ἀλλ' ἵνα γινῶ ὁ κόσμος: xvii. 16, Ἐγὼ ἐκ τ. κ. οὐκ εἰμὶ . . . ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κ. ὅτι σύ με ἀπίστευλας.¹

We hardly know what to say about this amazing note, except to call Canon Fremantle's attention to the fact that the use of the word κόσμος is fully discussed in a work which can scarcely be considered inaccessible, Dr. Westcott's *Commentary on S. John's Gospel*.² We certainly fail to recognize the variations in sense in the passages quoted. Are we to understand that the 'world' which our Lord prayed might believe that the Father had sent Him was a different world from that of which He said 'They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world'? And are we seriously asked to believe that when our Saviour said to Pilate 'My kingdom is not of this world,' He meant only that His kingdom did not belong to the present transitory condition of the world, but implied that it was of this world in a different and truer sense? It appears from a passage in the third lecture³ that this is Canon Fremantle's opinion. For the rest, it is true of course that αἰών has a temporal significance, but do we not also read, 'The world (ὁ κόσμος) passeth away and the lust thereof'?⁴

Apart, however, from the attempt to connect his conception of the 'world' with Scriptural usage, we need not quarrel with Canon Fremantle's original definition of the term as an

¹ P. 377.

² Additional Note to chap. i. 10.

³ P. 109. See below, p. 81.

⁴ 1 S. John ii. 17.

English word. Practically he uses it (as we all do) for humanity at large. A redeemed world is, therefore, equivalent to 'a redeemed humanity,' and this to 'a universal Church.'¹ But when we ask what Canon Fremantle understands by the Church, the ultimate answer is somewhat surprising. 'It can be nothing else,' we are told at first, 'than that portion of human society which is renewed by the Christian spirit, a portion which must grow till it becomes the whole.'² But this Christian spirit proves to be merely unselfishness and love, and the establishment of 'just relations.' 'Human relations' are the special object for which the Church exists.³ More precisely, 'human justice, in its highest and Christian sense, is the thing chiefly aimed at by the Church.'⁴ And, in short, the 'Church' turns out to be the same thing as the 'World' when the latter term is not qualified by a demonstrative pronoun. The world, indeed, is at present in an unreal condition, but then so is the Church. 'The Church is in process of formation, it is never complete. It constitutes an aspiration, not a full possession.' It is not a complete organization to which additional members may from time to time be added. It is in 'a transitional state,' and is 'now mainly represented by a brotherhood of Christian nations, and the various circles of moral life which they include.'

Of these circles Canon Fremantle distinguishes seven, 'within the great circle of the complete humanity, which forms the eighth.'⁵ The first of these is what most of us in our ignorance have hitherto considered to be the Church. The Bampton lecturer again and again most earnestly assures us that we are mistaken. It is merely 'the organization which exists for the conduct of public worship, to which are joined Christian exhortation and works of beneficence.'⁶ We are encouraged to hope that in the 'Church' of the future this organization 'will hold a high, and even the highest, place as the inspirer of the whole,'⁷ but in order to qualify itself for this honourable position it must not give itself airs. It must get rid entirely of 'clericalism,' and its affairs must be managed by 'the parish or commune . . . on the constitutional system, which springs direct from the spirit of Christian brotherliness.'⁸ In former times 'exaggerated stress' has been laid 'on public worship, its forms, its special doctrines.'⁹ We must change all that. We must be careful not to ascribe to Christianity 'a sacerdotal or a dogmatic basis.'¹⁰ We must, in fact, 'iden-

¹ P. 23. ² P. 9. ³ P. 281. ⁴ P. 165. ⁵ P. 299. ⁶ P. 300.
⁷ P. 334. ⁸ P. 335. ⁹ P. 231; cf. p. 236. ¹⁰ P. 91.

tify Christianity with moral goodness,'¹ and the organization for public worship

'can never be the organ of universal love so long as correct definitions of the great objects of faith and of the spiritual processes of redemption are made the test of fellowship; for these are matters which must always appear different to different minds, and which, indeed, are incapable of definition.'²

We must not be too particular about 'forms of organization,' or take up too much time with 'speculations about another world.'³ In short, 'the organization for public worship' may be allowed to exist, and even to hold a somewhat dignified position, provided it lays aside its organic structure, and dispenses with such useless formalities as definite creeds and positive institutions. What it would be like when it had accomplished this happy transformation we have failed distinctly to apprehend. After all this it will not surprise the reader to learn that all the other 'circles' within the 'Church of Humanity' realize in different ways the 'Church idea.' The Family comes first in order, then follow societies for the pursuit of Knowledge, such as schools, universities, literary clubs, and the like. The pursuit of Art constitutes another branch of the 'Church.' Social intercourse in all its forms, including games, sport, and the dance,⁴ furnishes another. Trade and Commerce mark off one more department of the Universal Church, and the Nation comes last as the most complete embodiment at present existing of the ecclesiastical principle.

In fact, since it cannot be pretended that Humanity, as a whole, is as yet bound together by any spirit which even Canon Fremantle can call Christian, he is forced to be content with the Nation as practically furnishing the ideal of the Church as he conceives it. The case of a 'Christian' nation is of course assumed, but the lecturer is careful to explain that it is of no consequence that all the members of the nation should be 'consciously' Christian. Dr. Pusey, it will be remembered, described London as one of the largest heathen cities in the world. But, according to Canon Fremantle, we must not look too closely into such matters. We must take people in the mass. Any form of unselfishness, or indeed of mutual helpfulness, entitles men to be considered Christians. Any society of men bound together by 'just relations' may be considered to be pervaded by the spirit of Christ's life. The civilized nations of Europe conform sufficiently to this

¹ P. 289.

² P. 301.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ P. 315.

standard, and hence may be reckoned as 'Churches' without further examination. Within the Nation all societies of men which require for their continuance any kind of co-operation and mutual forbearance may be placed side by side, as departments or branches of the National Church. The 'organization for public worship' is merely one of these, and stands on precisely the same footing as a Railway Company, or the Carlton Club, or the Royal Academy. That these societies, or the persons composing them, should 'consciously' name the name of Christ is quite unimportant. What is important is that we should recognize in the Christian Magistrate the true ruling elder,¹ and get rid of the idea that the functionaries of the organization for worship have any special claim to the title. Indeed, according to Canon Fremantle, as we have already seen, far too much has been made of public worship in the past. He more than once calls attention to the fact that in the vision of the New Jerusalem there is no temple.² He does not seem to have noticed that the reason assigned for this is that 'the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof.'³ He says there is hardly a word about public worship in our Lord's discourses.⁴ He admits that the existence of Church-worship is no doubt recognized in the New Testament, but discovers there 'only one distinct exhortation to public worship (Heb. x. 25, to which may perhaps be added Heb. xiii. 15).'⁵ We should have thought that, in view of the history of the Church from the earliest times, the inference to be drawn from the comparative silence of the Apostles on the subject of public worship is, that it was assumed as a matter of course and was so generally recognized as a duty, that it needed little enforcement.⁶ Canon Fremantle's inference is, that it was regarded by the first Christian teachers as of very little importance. This being so, we are prepared to find that the lecturer makes small account of the Christian Sacraments. He desires 'only such sacramental media as are needed for the bare assertion of the relationship' of the 'Christian spirit of universalism.'⁷ The doctrine of baptismal regeneration is, he says, 'untenable when baldly stated.' The substratum of truth underlying it is that 'those who have been brought up within the Christian community imbibe into the very texture of their moral nature

¹ Cf. pp. 231, 268.² Pp. 135, 300.³ Rev. xxi. 22.⁴ P. 100.⁵ P. 333.⁶ It is hardly necessary to point out how much of the First Epistle to the Corinthians is taken up with directions for the conduct of Public Worship, which is only not enjoined because it is presupposed.⁷ Pp. 328, 329.

*some of the primary assumptions of Christian morality.*¹ Of the Holy Eucharist he uses language which appears to assert a real communion of the individual believer with the living Christ, and we trust indeed that this is what Canon Fremantle desires to affirm. He speaks truly of its being 'the centre of a sacramentalism which extends through the whole range of human existence,'² a doctrine in which we heartily concur. It is an important truth that of our common food, no less than of our Eucharistic feast, it must be said that 'Man doth not live by bread alone.' It is most true that the discoveries of science and the productions of art reveal to those who can interpret them aright the wisdom and the love of God manifested in nature. But it makes all the difference whether we recognize in the Holy Eucharist a unique means of grace, or level it down to the position of merely natural things. We find it difficult to reconcile the former conception with the general tone of these lectures, and we can hardly resist the conclusion that the latter is what Canon Fremantle intends when we read at the close of a passage in which the sacramental character of family life, art, science, and the like for the Christian is truly asserted:—'It is not too much to say that he who thus appropriates the world realizes at every turn the inner meaning of the words "Take, eat, this is my body."'³ We can only understand this as implying that when a person recognizes the studies, the art, the objects of desire which bind men together in family-life and society as channels of love, beauty, and truth, and (because these are divine) as 'means by which we associate ourselves with God and Christ,' he is a partaker of the Body of our Lord, at least as much as one who seeks for that gift in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

At any rate Canon Fremantle calls upon us to recognize in each of the 'circles' within the 'Church,' no less than in the 'organization for public worship,' an 'organized Church worship—the priest, the prayer, the sacrament, the service.'⁴ Bearing in mind what we have seen as to the 'unconscious' character of much of the Christianity acknowledged as such by Canon Fremantle, we shall readily perceive what this amounts to. Taking, for instance, the case of the Nation as the most complete example of the lecturer's idea of a Church, we are told:—

'We ought . . . to regard the Nation as the Church, its rulers as ministers of Christ, its whole body as a Christian brotherhood, its public assemblies as amongst the highest modes of universal Christian

¹ P. 289.² P. 303.³ P. 294.⁴ P. 294.

fellowship, *its dealing with material interests as Sacraments, its progressive development, especially in raising the weak, as the fullest service rendered on earth to God, the nearest thing as yet within our reach to the kingdom of heaven.*'¹

When we are dealing with a Christian community (and it will be remembered we must look at such a community in the mass) 'we must credit its rulers with a sense of responsibility as office-bearers in the Church.' Such a community, Canon Fremantle adds, is the Body of Christ, and the civil laws edify the Body of Christ.²

In short, when Canon Fremantle recites in the Creed his belief in the Holy Catholic Church, all that he means apparently is that there are certain nations which in popular language may be called Christian. He considers that what other people call the Church is merely a department of the Civil Service, premising, however, that the Civil Service is divine in its origin and sanctions. 'The organization for worship is distinctly and demonstrably a formation of man; the family and the State are institutions of nature and of God.'³ Hence he does not hesitate to say that the Nation becomes 'more and more the object of mental regard, of admiration, of love, *even of worship* (for in it pre-eminently God dwells).'⁴

It is extraordinary that such a theory as this should have been put forward by a priest of the Church of England, and still more extraordinary we may add that it should have been promulgated in a course of Bampton Lectures! But our astonishment and pain are not lessened when we look more closely into the views which the author appears to hold with regard to the foundations of the Christian faith.

We have already noticed Canon Fremantle's dislike of exact definitions of the Christian faith, and we can only suppose that the extreme laxity of the language which he permits himself to use must be due to his not having given much attention to a subject so distasteful to him as dogmatic theology. He lays stress upon a view of the Divine Nature which he describes as that of the 'immanence of God in nature and in man.'⁵ There is a sense in which this doctrine is most true, and Canon Fremantle rightly points out that it is in no way incompatible with the doctrine that God transcends the visible and cognizable universe. But when we read in another place that 'the genius of Christianity requires us to conceive . . . of God *not as separate but as a spirit pervading the universe*,'⁶ we cannot but feel that we have got dangerously near

¹ P. 324.⁴ P. 321.² Pp. 241, 242.⁵ P. 17.³ P. 320.⁶ P. 285.

to a crude form of Pantheism. And throughout the lectures we have failed to recognize any clear and definite conception of God as a Personal Being distinct from the works of His own hands. He is spoken of rather as the Central and Supreme Unity of the universe, whatever that may mean. There are expressions here and there which, taken by themselves, imply the Personality of God, a doctrine which we do not doubt that Canon Fremantle holds. But he has contrived to leave all the practical consequences of the Divine Personality so entirely in the background, that these expressions have the effect of being little more than personifications of the world-spirit. It is a natural result of this way of looking at the subject that the ideas of sin and of revelation alike fall completely out of view. The word sin occurs in the book once or twice, but there is nothing which implies any recognition of sin as an offence against a Personal and Holy Creator. The faults from which men need to be redeemed are exclusively treated as failures to preserve just relations with their fellow-men. The redemption of the world is not regarded as the reconciliation of fallen creatures to a loving God, but merely the progress from a state of society in which unjust relations are common to a better state in which just relations shall prevail.¹ In the same way the notion of Christianity as a revelation—that is, as a communication of truth from a Personal God to His creatures—is entirely absent from the lectures. The author conceives of Christianity apparently as the best and noblest moral system in existence, but he expressly repudiates the idea that it has any exclusive claims upon mankind.²

'To suppose,' he says, 'that Christianity as it at present exists among us is to supersede all other systems or ideals would be to narrow fatally the life of mankind.'³ 'The ideal of life presented by Sakyamouni, or by Mahomet, or, again, by Plato, or by Marcus Aurelius, or, in the later centuries, by Lorenzo de' Medici, or by Goethe, must partly be made to combine with our present Christian morality, partly be purified by it, *partly be allowed to amplify our idea of what is morally good and Christian.*'⁴

It follows, again, as a natural consequence that the significance of the Incarnation is very dimly apprehended. In fact it is painful to notice the language which Canon Fremantle has thought it right to employ on this subject. Speaking of 'the absolute moral supremacy of our Lord in human nature,' he adds in a note:—

¹ Cf. pp. 135, 136.² P. 150.³ P. 43.⁴ P. 26.

'This moral supremacy is only another form for the assertion of our Lord's divinity. If the idea of the Divine immanence be maintained, then Christ stands at the summit of the whole development in which God manifests Himself.'¹

And he goes on to quote Coloss. i. 15, 16. Again, he says:—

'The centre of all theology to a Christian lies in the *character* of Jesus Christ. While this is felt to be supreme, a secure basis is laid for theology and religion. That is the manifestation of the Divine, of God Himself; for no other God is conceivable henceforth than God as manifested in Christ. That manifestation of the Divine is *not bound up with any particular view of the Divine nature metaphysically considered*, nor with any view of human nature, in which our reason need find a stumbling-block, *nor with miracles regarded as violations of the natural order, nor with the Resurrection of our Lord, regarded as a physical phenomenon.*'²

We can hardly think that Canon Fremantle has seriously reflected upon the implications of these words. They appear to mean, if they mean anything, that the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ does not imply the doctrine of the Trinity, that it merely implies His moral supremacy as the crown and flower of humanity, which is the embodiment of the divine world-spirit, and that we may, without sacrificing the doctrine as so explained, reject the account of the Resurrection as historically untrue. May we, on this latter point, remind him of S. Paul's words? 'If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain . . . ye are yet in your sins.'³ We do not, indeed, quite understand how a 'physical phenomenon' is to be defined in this connexion; but we cannot but think that S. Paul's view of the Resurrection would have brought it within the range of Canon Fremantle's meaning.

In another passage Canon Fremantle undertakes to represent by a paraphrase the meaning of the opening paragraph of S. John's Gospel. This is what he conceives the Apostle to have intended to convey:—

'The Word, which is none other than God, was present in the whole process of creation, *that is, the moral and spiritual purpose is the central fact to be traced in the universe.* All things are made with reference to *it*, nothing is apart from *it*. This Word is the universal light which enlightens every man, the moral and spiritual centre of universal humanity; and this is true, although it was a light shining in darkness, playing upon a social state which did not comprehend it, although even the race of Israel, who were *its* own, who were specially adapted to receive it, did not receive it fully. But

¹ P. 21.

² Pp. 368, 369.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 14, 17.

those who did receive it, that is, the faithful in Israel, and, generally, in all ages and countries, became children of God; *their minds and hearts reflected the thought of God, they saw and felt truly. At length the Word found its adequate expression in the person of Jesus Christ. This was the culmination of the process; and the exhibition of Christ as the complete expression of the divine word (sic) forms the subject of the Gospel according to St. John.*¹

We are anxious to put the most favourable construction upon the writings of a Christian priest. But we expect a Bampton lecturer to weigh his words, and to be aware of the significance which will be naturally attached to them. And we are unable to interpret this passage in any other than a Socinian sense. The Word of which S. John speaks in the Prologue to his Gospel is identified with the moral and spiritual purpose of the universe. When S. John says 'He came unto His own, and they that were His own received Him not,' Canon Fremantle understands him to mean that the race of Israel did not fully comprehend this moral and spiritual purpose. The faithful, however, in all ages and countries did so, and the *culmination of this process* is described in the statement that 'at length the Word found its adequate expression in the person of Jesus Christ.' If language is to be taken strictly this passage can involve nothing else than a rejection of the doctrine of the *personal* pre-existence of our Lord. According to Catholic doctrine our Lord's Human Nature is *impersonal*. His Personality resides in His Godhead, and is eternal. He Who was thus from all eternity truly God assumed our human nature in its entirety, and at the Incarnation became perfectly Man. But no new Person came into existence at the Incarnation. The Person of Jesus Christ was the Person of the Word, and was Eternal and Divine. Canon Fremantle either does not understand this doctrine, or we cannot avoid the conclusion that he rejects it.²

¹ Pp. 13, 14.

² Amongst other instances of language widely divergent from Catholic usage the following may be noticed:—

'If the Word of God is the light of men everywhere, and that Word is to be identified with the spirit of the life of Christ, then it follows that all moral truth is essentially Christian truth, and all true goodness Christian goodness' (p. 27). 'If the divinity of Christ was asserted' by the early Christians, 'this was the assertion, that He was morally supreme, the true image in humanity of the eternal power of love' (p. 145, cf. the note there). 'The Christian spirit . . . we may speak of either as the spirit of the universe, or of humanity, of Christ or of God. The universal spirit, since humanity is the crown of the universe, is the spirit of humanity. The spirit of humanity, since Christ is the head of humanity, is the spirit of Christ. The spirit of Christ, since Christ is one with God

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is presented with a similar confusion of thought or laxity of view. In some passages Canon Fremantle seems to identify the second and third Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Thus, on p. 17, he says, 'The idea of God as the Word and the Spirit is that to which both Scripture and experience point as specially suitable to our age.'¹ But more usually the Holy Spirit is implied to be nothing more than the moral influence of the life of Christ upon the minds and hearts of men. Thus in the immediate context of the passage just quoted the author says:—

'It is evident that what we have to do as believers in God is not to speculate upon His abstract nature, or to think of realms altogether beyond the range of human experience, but to trace the course of nature and history as moving under the divine impulse, to make ourselves conscious of the constraining moral force of the life of Christ, which, as the crown of the development, fully represents the divine power within, and of the Spirit which has flowed from this life throughout the Christian ages, to estimate and to associate ourselves with the intention which may be traced in the development of the world, and to follow it out with all our energy to its furthest results as organs of the Divine Spirit and as fellow-workers with God.'²

Elsewhere we read that 'the spirit of Christ is the true spirit of humanity,' and that 'every human society demands for its proper completion that spirit of which the life and death of Christ are the fullest expression—the spirit of self-renouncing love.'³ 'The character of the Founder' of Christianity, Canon Fremantle remarks, 'hardly anyone really attacks: His Spirit almost everyone, consciously or unconsciously, acknowledges. And this *character and spirit* are now almost universally recognized by defenders of the faith as the central and preponderant evidence of Christianity.' He goes on to urge that Christians should try to 'exhibit the real power of Christ and of His Spirit as a redeeming influence in the whole wide field of human life.'⁴ The present condition of Christendom is described as that of a world 'in which the Spirit of Christ's life is generally acknowledged by the public conscience.'⁵ In the course of a careful perusal of the book we have not noticed among the many passages in which the Spirit is spoken of one which clearly and unequivocally asserts or implies His personality.⁶

is the spirit of God' (pp. 291, 292). This either means that Christ is the human embodiment of a pantheistic world-spirit, or we do not know what it means.

¹ P. 17. Compare the passage quoted in the last note.

² Pp. 17, 18.

³ P. 33.

⁴ P. 369.

⁵ P. 362.

⁶ In one passage (pp. 366, 367) it is said of the 'Divine spirit' (*sic*) that

So far as it is indicated in the lectures, Canon Fremantle's anthropology seems to be hardly more happy than his theology. He accepts the doctrine of Evolution, not merely within the sphere of organic life, but as breaking down the barriers which have been supposed to separate organic from inorganic matter.¹ Now, it is true that the doctrine of Evolution in its most materialistic form does not prevent us from recognizing those characteristics of human life which usage compels all men to call 'moral,' as the highest results of the process of development. What it does involve is a new interpretation of those characteristics. We can, and indeed must, in such a case continue to use all the familiar terms of morality, because they are appropriated by custom to the description of phenomena, the existence of which no one denies. But those who believe morality to be merely the highest result of Evolution, and therefore to be simply the outcome of physical laws, use the terms in question in a new sense. Such an Evolutionist still says that certain actions 'ought' to be done, but he means by this only that if they are not done certain unpleasant results will follow either to the agent or to society at large. He still speaks of a man's 'duty'; but this term indicates for him only such conduct as tends in the direction of the actual course of social development, or, it may be, such conduct as the majority of men happen at the given moment to approve. Canon Fremantle thinks, however, that Evolution, as he understands it, is not 'repugnant to a sober assertion of free-will and

'He forms' the Church, but in the context this Divine spirit is identified with 'Christianity, as a spiritual power which cannot be precisely defined, but which is known and felt in its effects, as the spirit of the God whose name is Love, a spirit which is not seen but blows where it lists, yet which we know to be gradually renewing the world.'

¹ No doubt if these barriers could be swept away life would be none the less wonderful or mysterious. We are convinced, however, that the distinction between the organic and inorganic spheres of nature is fundamental, not merely because at our present stage of experimental knowledge the doctrine of Biogenesis is confessedly 'victorious along the whole line,' but because the very notion of life implies phenomena which are different *in kind* from those of chemical and mechanical force. In the language of philosophy these phenomena belong to a higher category than those of inorganic nature, and require a new conception to grasp them. That the one, therefore, should ever be developed out of the other *without the introduction of any new factor* is inconceivable. If such an evolution is to be supposed at all, it can only be by conceiving the essential characteristics of life as already latent in the so-called 'inorganic matter.' We are apt to be afraid that life should be shown to be a kind of chemical process, but if such an identification should ever take place, the fact would rather be that chemical processes would be shown to be a kind of life. (Cf. Principal Caird, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 101-118.)

independence';¹ and a note in the Appendix professes to deal with the subject. It there appears that he is concerned to defend the doctrine of Evolution from the 'reproach of fatalism.' Philosophic writers commonly recognize a distinction between Fatalism and Determinism. The Fatalist asserts that our conduct is determined by the causes which act upon us in such a way that we cannot act otherwise however much we may wish to do so. The Determinist affirms that our actions are dependent on our wishes, but adds that these wishes are themselves the result of the combined action of our character and our circumstances. But Determinism no less than Fatalism will be felt to cut at the root of all true morality and religion, when it is once realized that according to this theory character and circumstances are alike formed *for* us, and are ultimately dependent upon the chain of natural causes.²

The only form of Fatalism, however, which Canon Fremantle thinks Christian faith would count immoral would be one that involved such an element as 'compulsion by physical causes *ab extra*.' But the odd thing is that he seems to think he is advancing arguments in favour of free-will by referring to the variations of animals and plants recognized by Mr. Darwin as one of the conditions of the law of Natural Selection! Mr. Darwin, of course, as Canon Fremantle is aware, believed these variations to be due to the operation of natural causes, although he thought that the laws of variation were not in all cases ascertainable. But the facts cited here as laying the ground 'for all that any sober assertor of free-will in the human individual would claim,' are simply such as the sudden sporting of plants and the divergence of character among animals. Does Canon Fremantle really think that any assertor of free-will, sober or otherwise, means by it merely that human beings differ as individual plants do, or that there is anything in common between the self-determination of the spiritual principle in man and 'the sudden appearance of new forms of vegetable life like the teasel'? Yet his answer to the reproach of fatalism amounts to nothing else.

Nor, if the lecturer's view of the nature of man, as a free moral agent, is unsatisfactory, is his conception of his future destiny more clear or reassuring. In one or two passages

¹ P. 22.

² John Stuart Mill argued earnestly that we can modify our character *if we wish to do so*, but the question under what conditions we shall have this wish brings us round to exactly the same point as before.

Canon Fremantle speaks of a future life as an object of legitimate hope and expectation, but again and again throughout the lectures he condemns 'speculations about another world' as unprofitable, and transfers to this world Scriptural expressions which Christian people have in all ages understood as having reference to the next. He would have us believe that when the early Christians called themselves *πάροικοι*, 'it was because they looked constantly for a new state of society which was to emerge out of the old.'¹ The New Jerusalem seen in vision by S. John had, he tells us, no reference to a heavenly state beyond this world, but simply to a better condition of the present state of things.² S. Paul, he allows, seems to have looked for an actual personal coming of our Lord in the immediate future. This, however, he puts down to a too literal interpretation of figurative expressions, and such expectations, he intimates, were never destined to be realized.³

It is, perhaps, true, as Canon Fremantle repeatedly remarks, that the anticipation of a future life of blessedness has sometimes withdrawn men's attention unduly from the practical duties of their present condition. Eternal life, as he rightly contends, is not merely a future state; it is begun here and now. But while it is certainly wrong to ignore the obligations of the present life, that life no less certainly assumes a different complexion when it is believed to be the prelude to an eternal future. No wonder that men have sometimes gone to an extreme, and made *too* little account of the joys and sorrows of this world, when they have reflected upon all that is implied in the doctrine of their immortality. Say what we will, man needs a personal and individual hope to nerve him for his struggles against temptation, and to ensure his steadfastness under failure. And the hopes which this world offers are too narrow to content him. Some persons, indeed, have tried to solace themselves with the thought of joining the 'Choir invisible' of those who partake of a subjective immortality in the grateful remembrance of future generations: but for the majority so vague an expectation is insufficient. It seems more reasonable to adopt, if not with despairing recklessness, at least with a grim and stoical acquiescence, the principle implied in the words 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' But a practical belief in a life beyond the grave changes the whole aspect of the world. It

¹ P. 127. Canon Fremantle admits that this hope was 'at first the hope of a heavenly rather than an earthly state.'

² Pp. 135, 362.

³ P. 136.

is this which has nerved the timorous, and supported the weary, and soothed the suffering, and solaced the lonely and oppressed. It is this which has often checked the tempted, and sobered the frivolous, and stimulated the slothful. It is this which has given courage to the martyr and peace to the saint. Man is immortal, and in his better and deeper moments he knows it. And it is idle to bid him, as Canon Fremantle does, to put aside the thought of his eternal future, or to bring it in only as it were to supplement more important considerations. If we are indeed destined to live eternally, the fact that this life is a preparation for the next cannot but be of supreme importance; the affairs of this life must be of comparatively little moment in their vanity and evanescence. And those who realize all this vividly will share the feeling of Browning's 'Grammarian':—

'Others mistrust and say, "But time escapes;
Live now or never!"

He said, "What's time? Leave Now for dogs and apes!
Man has Forever."

Amid such views of God, of nature, and of man as we meet with in these lectures, it can hardly surprise us to find a conception of Religion which seems to dispense with the necessity of the worship or even of the conscious recognition of God. Religion is, indeed, defined as consisting in the relations of spiritual beings, but it is implied that it is not necessary that God should enter into the relation.¹ The true subject-matter of religion is said to consist in 'the establishment and maintenance of human relations.'² And we are told that human history, as being the history of human relations, is necessarily the history of religion.³ In another passage it is suggested that 'good taste, which governs artistic performance, lies mainly in the perception of harmony, in the *esprit d'ensemble*, which is almost identical with religion.'⁴ And so Christianity in particular is practically identified with culture, which, indeed, Canon Fremantle thinks 'is hardly to be distinguished from the spirit of Christ.'⁵

It might be supposed that whatever could be said for Canon Fremantle's views, considered as an independent speculation, it would at least be difficult to connect them with Holy Scripture or with the history of the Church. He does not, however, shrink from the task.

The history of the Jewish Church is treated on the basis

¹ Cf. pp. 48, 49.

² P. 95.

³ P. 49.

⁴ P. 37.

⁵ P. 39.

of the theory of Professor Robertson Smith and his German masters, and a short excursus in the Appendix professes to give a summary of the arguments by which this theory is supported. We do not, of course, question the right of anyone to enter upon the discussion of the date and authenticity of the Books of the Old Testament in a purely critical spirit. But we must protest against the assumption that the controversy on these points is as good as decided. There can be no question that the traditional view of the origin of the Pentateuch involves serious difficulties. What is not sufficiently recognized is that on the one hand the solutions of the problem offered by modern critics also involve serious difficulties, and that on the other hand those of the traditional view are by no means always incapable of explanation. The majority of the arguments, for instance, commonly urged against the Mosaic date of the Levitical Law may be simply met by the consideration that after the entrance into Canaan, partly in consequence of the disunion of the tribes, and partly from other causes, the observance of the Law fell into disuse and abeyance. That it was not observed is, indeed, obvious. But the assumption that the Levitical Law was not then in existence introduces at least as many difficulties as it solves. Take, for example, the law of the divinely-chosen altar, which is referred to by Canon Fremantle.¹ The twenty-second chapter of the Book of Joshua has all the marks of authentic history, and, if it be accepted as such, the story of the altar 'Ed' which it contains is conclusive as to the law in question being well known at the time of the conquest. To suppose that this law dates from the later times of the Jewish monarchy involves the conclusion that the account of the altar set up by the two tribes and a half on the east of the Jordan, and of the indignation aroused by it, was a late forgery invented for the purpose of giving the colour of ancient authority to a novel restriction—a conclusion for which there is absolutely no ground except the exigencies of a theory.²

In any case, it surely should be borne in mind that the

¹ P. 402.

² It may be remarked in passing that, whatever the date of the Books of the Pentateuch may be, they unquestionably underwent a process of editorial redaction at a later period, and when this is remembered it becomes evident that a multitude of minor points, which are put forward as evidence by modern theorists, cease to have any importance. Particular phrases and expressions can seldom be relied upon in such a case as affording any trustworthy indication of date. This, however, is not urged as applying to the considerations brought forward by Canon Fremantle.

question of the authenticity of a great part of the Old Testament history is bound up with that of the substantial genuineness of the Pentateuchal Law. It is not fair that crude theories on the latter point should be offered to us as matters of course, without a hint of the magnitude of the issues involved. It is possible, indeed, that some old-fashioned views may ultimately have to be somewhat modified, but the time has not yet come for dealing with the subject finally, and it certainly should not be treated off-hand.

The theory that the Levitical Law was of post-exilic date falls in, however, with Canon Fremantle's doctrine that true religion consists in nothing but just social relations. It enables him to treat the ceremonial and sacrificial element in the original Law as inconsiderable in extent, and to depreciate the developed ceremonial system as a priestly scheme subsequently introduced, and superseding the earlier and purer religion.¹ Judaism undoubtedly aimed at establishing justice, mercy, and truth amongst men, and Canon Fremantle will see in it nothing of any value besides.

We can only understand this readiness to depreciate the ceremonial law, which is so common at the present day, by supposing that it has not been studied in its typical and prophetic aspect. No one, we feel assured, who has tried to enter into the teaching of the Jewish sacrifices and ordinances with regard to the redemptive work of our Blessed Lord will be ready to think them of little value or importance.

The 'simple stories of the Patriarchs in the Book of Genesis,' Canon Fremantle thinks, were intended simply to establish true principles of family life. To us they appear to be a record of the progressive education of chosen individuals in the knowledge and the fear of God. The sacrifice of Isaac is surely not meant to point out to us the right relations between father and son. It is a noble history of faith in a Personal God, issuing in a desire to offer to Him the best and dearest gift possessed by the offerer. It enshrines a promise of the Lamb Whom God was afterwards to provide for Himself as a worthy offering. It displays a willingness of self-surrender which, however needing further enlightenment and education, shadows forth in dim human fashion the mysterious self-surrender of Almighty God, Who spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all. Those who see in such a story only a 'tale of family life' can hardly be thought to have considered it at all deeply.

The Book of Exodus, we are told, expands these family

¹ Cf. p. 88.

relations into those of the nation. And we are invited to see in the 'Law of Jehovah,' which was so obviously the centre of the national life, merely a moral and civil code. It is compared with the English Constitution.¹ The true convictions of the people, we are told, may best be seen in their poetry, and Canon Fremantle discovers in the Psalms only a few faint allusions to ceremonial customs, and very little of what he calls 'artificial religion,' but abundant appeals to the law of public and private justice.² No one doubts that the moral sublimity of the Law of Jehovah was a subject on which the Psalmists loved to dwell, but it is impossible to read their writings with attention without being struck with the intense consciousness which they display of a personal relation to God, of Whose personal holiness this law is regarded as a practical expression. Personal trust, personal love, personal devotion towards Jehovah, of these the Psalms are full.

'As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God : when shall I come and appear before God ?' 'Against Thee, Thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight ; that Thou mightest be justified when Thou speakest, and be clear when Thou judgest. . . . Hide Thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities. Create in me a clean heart, O God ; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from Thy presence ; and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me.'

Surely in words like these there is something besides enthusiasm for a system of just relations. That the ceremonial law is not prominent in the Psalms we readily admit, but what is prominent is the personal relation of a holy and merciful Creator to His creatures. Sacrificial rites are indeed shown to be empty and valueless when associated with iniquity, but the duties which are in that case contrasted with them are personal penitence and personal obedience and thanksgiving.³

But Canon Fremantle talks about *identifying* Jehovah with the righteousness expressed in the law,⁴ and when the personality of God is thus left out of account, the Jewish history is naturally treated as a record of the moral develop-

¹ P. 54.

² P. 53. Canon Fremantle is unfortunate in his quotations. Of the four passages which he gives as specimens of those which do refer to the ceremonial law, two cannot be said to illustrate the subject. There were no 'laws of drink-offerings of blood,' to which Psalm xvi. 4 could allude, and Psalm cxli. 4 ('Let me not eat of their dainties') either refers to heathen sacrifices, or merely to sharing the luxurious life of ungodly men.

³ Cf. Psalms xl. 6-8 ; l. 8-15 ; li. 16, 17.

⁴ Cf. p. 75.

ment of a nation which had a taste for righteousness, and whose moral and political ideas were consequently in advance of other nations. Righteousness is the manifestation of God amongst men, and *therefore* the Jews may be said to have heard the voice of God speaking to them.¹

In the third lecture Canon Fremantle passes to the consideration of the New Testament Church as exhibiting the beginnings of the universal society. He mentions, as the primary aim of our Lord's ministry, the renewal in men's minds of 'the consciousness of the Fatherhood of God, and the inner and spiritual life, the life of gratitude and affection which flows from this consciousness,'² but the individual aspect of His work, even to this extent, having been once alluded to, is practically put out of sight. The account given of our Saviour's purpose amounts to this: that He came to restore the true ideal of the Jewish commonwealth, viz. social and political righteousness which had been overlaid by ceremonial accretions; that He originally thought it possible that this plan would succeed, and that the Jews would be won by persuasion, would adopt the principle of just relations, and would become the missionaries of that principle to the rest of the world.

'It is interesting' (to Canon Fremantle) 'to imagine the possible course of events had this hope been realized; how the Jews might have become the apostles of a simple human righteousness and the belief in the One God to mankind, and the sacrifice of a laborious and a successful life, instead of that of an ignominious death, have been the means of reconciling the world to God.'³

The rulers of the people, however, refused to enter into the scheme, and our Lord consequently adopted a different method, and laid the foundations of a new community which should supersede that of the Jews, and gradually spread 'just relations' throughout the world.

In short, when our Lord said that His kingdom was not of this world, Canon Fremantle understands Him to have meant that it was of this world, merely implying that it was not to be built up by force or fraud. He was giving utterance, in fact, to 'a political revelation,' viz. that 'govern-

¹ P. 73. How entirely the notion of the personal providence of God in the Jewish history is left out of view in this lecture may be seen by referring to the way in which calamity following upon the non-observance of the law is explained, 'without having recourse to miracle,' by the conditions of the life of 'simple agricultural industry' in Palestine (p. 77). Compare the account given of the relations of Judah to Egypt and Assyria (pp. 80 *sqq.*).

² P. 97.

³ P. 102.

ment is essentially a moral and spiritual process ; it is only secondarily one of compulsion ; and it is directed ultimately not to material, but to spiritual ends.' Our Lord's kingdom was 'an expansion of the Jewish ideal.'¹

With this Ebionite conception of our Lord's mission we find associated only a moral theory of the Atonement. Nowhere is our Saviour's death recognized as a Divine transaction, availing by its infinite efficacy to cleanse from the guilt of sin. It is merely treated as a tragic and beautiful martyrdom in the cause of truth and in the interests of the human race, influencing men for good by the example of its noble self-sacrifice.²

All this is surely very different from the Christianity of the Apostles and Evangelists. Our Lord did indeed teach men their social duties. He did enforce the inner principles of the old Law. But He did much more than this. He revealed Himself to men as their personal Saviour. He declared Himself to be the true Vine apart from Whom it was impossible to bear fruit. He declared that men must personally appropriate, not merely His example, but Himself, becoming actually united with Him. He declared that to such as thus became one with Him, He would give eternal life, and raise them up at the last day. And the Apostles understood this literally ; to be 'in Christ' was their safety,³ to be sprinkled with the blood of Christ gave the assurance of their pardon.⁴ They saw in Him the Lamb of God, through Whose precious blood they were redeemed.⁵ They discerned in His death the one sacrifice for sins.⁶ And they believed all this because they knew Him to be more than man. He had subsisted originally in the form of God, and yet counted it not a thing to be clung to, to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, and, taking the form of a servant, became obedient even unto death.⁷ By baptism, they taught, men are united to this Divine Person,⁸ thus they become members of His Body,⁹ thus they are built up into a Holy Temple, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone.¹⁰

It is quite true that the Church of Christ is the kingdom of God on earth. It is quite true that the Church has social

¹ P. 113.

² This, at least, is the only interpretation we can place upon the passage quoted above (from p. 102) and such other allusions as we have noticed to the effects of the death of Christ. Cf. pp. 30, 33, 41, 98, and 296 note.

³ 2 Cor. v. 17.

⁴ 1 S. Pet. i. 2.

⁵ 1 S. Pet. i. 18, 19.

⁶ Heb. x. 12.

⁷ Philipp. ii. 6-8.

⁸ Rom. vi. 1-4 ; Col. ii. 2, 3.

⁹ 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13 ; Galat. iii. 27, 28.

¹⁰ Ephes. ii. 20, 21.

duties. But to recognize nothing further than this, to say simply that Christ came to found a new social state in the form of a purified Judaism, is something worse than misleading. It is not enough to say that it is an inadequate statement. It omits the very things which give to Christianity its vitality and its supreme importance. Christianity is either a supernatural revelation and a Divine means of reconciliation of sinners to their Creator, or it is a system of false pretences and unreal claims. If indeed Christians are partakers of the Divine Nature through union with the Incarnate God, if they are the temples of the in-dwelling presence of God the Holy Ghost, then we can understand that it is their mission to regenerate human society and to win for Christ the kingdoms of this world. But to substitute for the awful realities and solemn responsibilities of the Christian revelation a vague culture and a nebulous social and political morality, and to bid us look to these for the redemption of the world, is to mock us with hopes which carry upon their face the prophecy of failure. If Christianity has nothing better than this to offer us, let us at least call it by its right name, and drop the pretence that it is really a religion.

In the development of the early Church Canon Fremantle considers that the permanent organization took shape under the pressure of social necessities, and not in consequence of the needs of worship and teaching. That its teaching functions were not at first confined to any special order, or orders, of men may perhaps be plausibly contended. But in 1 Cor. xiv. 26, where it is said, 'When ye come together each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation,' it must be remembered that the manifestation of extraordinary *Charismata* in the Church is assumed.¹ In the immediate context the 'prophets' are spoken of as a separate class of persons, and at the outset of the discussion of the whole question, S. Paul appeals to the analogy of the distinct functions of different organs of the natural body, as showing that all are not apostles, or prophets, or teachers, or the like.² According to Canon Fremantle,

¹ Canon Fremantle in quoting the passage omits the reference to the revelation and the speaking with tongues (p. 132).

² 1 Cor. xii. 12-31. Canon Fremantle's assumption that 1 Tim. ii. 8 applies specially to public worship and to the men *leading* in prayer (p. 132) is purely gratuitous. So, in his reference to the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, it is quite arbitrary to assume that the injunction, 'Whosoever therefore cometh and teacheth you all the things aforesaid, receive him,' is to be understood as applying to any but the apostles, prophets, and teachers, who are clearly regarded throughout the document as holding special and recognized offices in the Church.

however, the Apostles hoped at first that the Jewish nation would in its corporate capacity accept the new social principles which they had chiefly in view; and it was not until this hope was finally relinquished that the government of the Church began to assume a permanent form in the communities founded by S. Paul. Whether we regard the structure of these communities as modelled upon that of the Jewish synagogues, or that of the *Hetæriæ*, or clubs of the Empire, we are invited to consider them as at least as much concerned with social organization as with teaching or worship. In practice, no doubt, teaching and worship were prominent in the synagogues, but this, it is said, was an accident of the circumstances under which those institutions arose. We are reminded that, if the nation had been free, their Constitution would have included the functions of local government under the national Sanhedrim. In the main, therefore, Canon Fremantle follows Dr. Hatch, and regards the infant Churches as clubs for mutual beneficence.¹ He takes their organization to have been simply a matter of convenience, freely adapted to the changing circumstances of the moment. The arbitrary character of the argument may be seen from the contention that since no presbyters or deacons are mentioned in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and no deacons in the Epistle to Titus, the corresponding offices may be assumed to have been non-existent at the date of those Epistles in the Churches of Corinth and Crete.² On the general question we will only make two remarks. First, that such plausibility as the argument for the 'plasticity' of Church organization derives from the allusions to Church officers in the writings of the New Testament, depends entirely upon the ignoring of the distinction between the temporary and permanent ministry, a distinction, by the way, which comes out very clearly in the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.' Referring to the lists given in 1 Cor. xii. and Ephes. iv., Bishop Lightfoot writes:—

¹ It should be noticed that throughout the lectures 'almsgiving,' or 'beneficence,' or 'charity,' is connected with prayer and instruction as one of the functions which benighted persons have recognized as belonging to the 'organization for public worship.' But for beneficence in this form Canon Fremantle always speaks in a tone of something like contempt.

² P. 129. Bishop Lightfoot remarks that by the 'helps' of 1 Cor. xii. 28, 'the diaconate, solely or chiefly, seems to be intended' (Philipp. p. 191). On S. Paul's first missionary journey, he and S. Barnabas are described as appointing presbyters in every church (Acts xiv. 23). It is not likely that he would have changed his practice in the interval between this and his visit to Corinth. Cf. S. Clement of Rome, 1 Ep. § 42.

'Neither list can have been intended to be exhaustive. In both alike the work of converting unbelievers and founding congregations holds the foremost place, while the permanent government and instruction of the several churches is kept in the background. This prominence was necessary in the earliest age of the Gospel. The apostles, prophets, evangelists, all range under the former head. But the permanent ministry, though lightly touched upon, is not forgotten; for under the designation of "teachers, helps, governments," in the one passage, of "pastors and teachers" in the other, these officers must be intended.'

To infer from such passages that a permanent ministry did not then exist, or that its form was accidental, is to ignore the evidence afforded by the history of the Church as a whole.

Our second remark is that so long as the question is treated as one between 'teaching and worship' on the one hand and 'government' on the other, it is easy to make out a case for the view that it was with the latter that the officers of the early Church were principally concerned. But the question so stated has a false simplicity because the Sacraments are left out of account. The whole subject assumes a different aspect when Christianity is regarded as essentially a sacramental system. We know that S. Paul considered S. Timothy to have received a special 'gift of God' through the laying on of his hands. We know that S. Philip baptized but did not attempt to convey the gift of the Holy Ghost, which was however conveyed by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles Peter and John. We have no evidence that an unordained layman or a deacon was ever permitted to celebrate the Eucharist in any Church recognized as such by the rest of Christendom. We have abundant evidence that from very early times episcopal ordination to the presbyterate was regarded as an indispensable qualification for consecrating the Eucharist. And it is this, and not the question whether preaching or social morality is the more important, which is the real point of the discussion. Those who regard Christianity as a superior system of social relations, and the early Christian Churches simply as benefit clubs, are not likely to feel that the precise form of the ministry is of any great consequence. Those who believe the Church to be the Divinely organized Body of Christ, united in a mysterious but most real union to her risen and ascended Lord, and by virtue of that union made a channel of supernatural grace to men, and those who study the history of the Church and inquire what

¹ Philipp. p. 185.

has always, everywhere, and by all her members been practised, and who remember the promise of Divine guidance bequeathed to her by her Lord, will not be disposed to underrate the importance to the spiritual life of a duly constituted and ordained ministry.

We have already referred to those portions of Canon Fremantle's lectures which treat of the Imperial and Mediæval Church, and of the Churches and sects of the Reformation period, as containing much that is interesting and suggestive. We have not space to enter upon a detailed examination of this part of the book, although there is much in it which calls for remark. We will only now observe that it is specially instructive, with regard to Canon Fremantle's ideal of the Church, to notice the conditions under which all attempts to identify Church and State have been made in the past. In every case it was assumed that all members of the proposed Christian community would hold the Christian faith in some one definite form, and would accept some particular mode of its 'positive institutions.' Under Savonarola no question arose of opposition to the common beliefs of the time. Under Calvin, a heretic was burned at Geneva. Under Knox the Covenant was rigidly enforced. Under the Puritans of New England Quaker women were stripped to the waist, and flogged through the towns amid frost and snow. Even Erastus, to whose system Canon Fremantle thinks it 'difficult to see what objection can be made,'¹ did not contemplate a state of things in which Christianity should be stripped of all dogmatic character. He confined his attention to those who being baptized held 'the pure doctrines of the Gospel.'² He held indeed that the Christian ruler was to 'settle religion according to the directions given in Holy Scripture, and to arrange the ministries thereof,' consulting experts in cases where doctrine was concerned.³ But he excluded the case of a Popish Government as not according apparently with his notion of what constituted a Christian ruler.⁴ Again and again in enumerating the causes of failure Canon Fremantle comes back to his lamentable complaint that people laid exaggerated stress upon 'public worship, its forms, its special doctrines.' The notion of toleration, in fact, in the sense in which we understand it, had not in those days occurred to anyone. Cartwright, the Puritan, maintained that heretics ought to be put to death, it being of course understood that he was not a heretic. Foxe, the martyrologist, wrote to Elizabeth in 1575,

¹ P. 222.² Cf. Theses 5, 9, 31, and 38.³ Thesis 74.⁴ Cf. Thesis 75.

begging her not to burn two Anabaptists, and so rekindle the fires of Smithfield, but he only objected on the ground that burning was a Popish form of punishment, and he suggested that they should be hanged instead. But what Canon Fremantle does not seem to have observed is, that it was just because toleration was not thought necessary or possible that the idea of making Church and State conterminous and identical seemed feasible to persons in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹ It may seem feasible again when Christian men are at one in doctrine and practice. But it has been reserved for Canon Fremantle to suggest a solution of the difficulty, which consists in depriving the Church of all distinctive characteristics, and reducing the Christian faith to the residuum of morality which may be conceived to remain when all dogmatic and ecclesiastical elements have been evaporated.

We must now draw to a close. We cannot pretend to have done more than glance at the leading positions and arguments of these lectures. We have not attempted to examine every statement which seems to us questionable, or every inference which we regard as unwarranted. But we may be allowed before concluding to call attention to the character of the demand for an undogmatic Christianity, which is so prominent a feature in the book.

The Catholic Faith tells us that there is one God of infinite holiness and awful majesty, in the mystery of Whose Eternal Being there exist three Real Subsistences or Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity. It tells us that the second of these Eternal Persons, very God of very God, became Incarnate in time, and lived on earth as true Man amongst men. It tells us that this Incarnate God suffered a shameful death for our sins, and rose again to a new and glorious and transfigured life. It tells us that, through means of God's appointment, we are united to this Divine Person, and through our union with Him obtain pardon, and are enriched with gifts of grace and the energy of a renewed life. It tells us that we become the temples of the presence of God the Holy Ghost, through Whose power we may attain to real sanctification. It tells us that we may hope for the issue of all this in a perfected life hereafter, and points us to an in-

¹ The case of Roger Williams's community of Rhode Island, to which Canon Fremantle refers, is an exception which proves the rule. Toleration was accorded, but precisely to the extent to which men availed themselves of it their union as a *religious body* became impossible.

heritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us.

These are not a set of speculative opinions about nature and life. They are statements of fact. They are either true or false. If they are false, then in the name of truth let them be given up. But if they are true, then they are and must be of quite infinite importance to each one of us. To bid us put them aside as of little consequence is to trifle with us. For we are sinners. We want individual pardon. We want peace with God, from Whom our sins have alienated us. We want power to conquer a corrupt nature, whose terrible potency is such as to wring even from a saint like S. Paul a cry almost of despair. It is idle to talk about waiving questions of dogma, for this is to waive the questions upon which everything depends. Christianity supplies our needs, it transforms our lives, it gives us hope and peace. But it does all this not because it is a superior system of social and political morality, but because it is a Divine method of making us one with God. And whenever a departure from the Catholic faith, however apparently insignificant, has taken place, the instinct of the Church has led her at once to fasten upon the heresy, in the conviction that consequences of the most intense practical importance may, or rather must be, involved.

Christian dogma tells us of the nature of God, and of the manner in which His love to us has been displayed. We cannot afford to disregard such truths; we ought not to wish to ignore the duty of humble gratitude which they impose upon us. It is our highest privilege, as well as our manifest obligation, not only to use with diligence the means of grace to which they point us, but to adore the Giver. 'The Catholic faith is this, that we *worship* one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.'

ART. V.—THE POSITION OF THE OLD IRISH CHURCH.

1. *Geschichte der altirischen Kirche*, &c. Von CARL JOHANN GREITH, Bischof von S. Gallen. 1867.
2. *Keltische Studien*. Von HEINRICH ZIMMER. Zweites Heft. 1884.

THE foundation of the monastery of S. Gall by an Irish missionary in the seventh century gives occasion to the present bishop of that see to introduce the Church of Ireland to the notice of his countrymen. The example of a Church 'founded with the blessing and under the authority of the Vicar of Christ upon earth, and from the beginning united in the closest bonds to the chair of S. Peter,' should in his opinion encourage German Roman Catholics to defend their rights, while it also has its use as 'a sign post to direct the learned men of England in their search after the Church founded by S. Augustine.'

This is taking high ground, and as Bishop Greith appears to be a person of some learning, it may be presumed he has put the matter in as favourable a point of view as the obstinate facts he has to deal with will allow. It is worth while, therefore, to examine his account of the origin of the Irish Church, and further to offer some suggestions as to its true position, from which it will probably appear that he is much too sanguine, and has undertaken to handle a topic very dangerous to the interests of his Church.

The first ray of light we have as to the beginning of Christianity in Ireland comes from the well-known passage in the Chronicle of Prosper of Aquitaine in which it is stated that Pope Celestine sent Palladius, A.D. 431, 'ad Scotos in Christum credentes.' This seems plain enough as to the existence of Christianity in Ireland before the Roman mission. Greith, however, considers it 'obscure,' and proposes to interpret it by quoting a Bishop Marcus, said to have lived A.D. 822, 'who, relying on the old Irish accounts of Palladius, explains Prosper's words thus: "While Patrick was preparing at Rome for his mission to Ireland Palladius was sent by Pope Celestine to convert the Irish people to Christ." It is evident that Bishop Marcus either had the text of Prosper before him or in his thoughts, and explained the obscure words "in Christum credentes" by "in Christum convertendos."'

This, however, is simply to contradict the plain language of the chronicle, and may be taken as an acknowledgment by our author that the facts are against him.

The mission of Palladius is acknowledged to have been a failure. It was not given to him, but to S. Patrick, to achieve the spiritual conquest of Ireland. The next inquiry, therefore, is, Did S. Patrick receive his commission from Rome? Here we are met at the outset by the fact that the chronicle of Prosper does not mention him, which, if he was sent by Celestine, it certainly would have done. The earliest document in which he is mentioned is his own *Confessio*, written shortly before his death. Greith is obliged to allow that this affords him no help. It contains, in fact, not the faintest allusion to a mission from Rome, while it speaks affectionately of Gaul and its clergy.

We next come, in the order of time, to the Hymn of Secundinus, or Sechnall, the companion and friend of S. Patrick. The third stanza of this most interesting composition thus describes S. Patrick. We quote Greith's text:—

'Constans in Dei timore et fide immobilis,
Super quem ædificatur, ut Petrus, ecclesia,
Cujusque apostolaturn a Deo sortitus est,
In cujus porta (portæ?) adversus inferni non prævalent'—

which Dr. Todd, who reads *portæ*, thus translates:—

'Constant in the fear of God, immovable in faith,
One upon whom, as a second Peter, the Church is built,
Who obtained from God the apostleship (of the Church),
To the injury of which (Church) the gates of hell prevail not.'

On this Greith observes, 'the Hymn of Sechnall, as falsely (*fälschlich*¹) rendered by Dr. Todd, has not indeed any mention of the mission of S. Patrick from Pope Celestine, but when correctly translated it has;' and so he gives his version as follows:—

'He was constant in the fear of God and immovable in faith,
Like Peter, upon whom the Church is built,
And whose apostleship he obtained from God,
Against whose bulwarks the gates of hell cannot prevail';²

¹ The italics are Greith's.

² *Codex Wurtsburgensis* in Zimmer's *Glossæ Hibernicæ*, p. 95. That this passage continues to exercise the ingenuity of Roman Catholic writers appears from an article in the *Scottish Review* of February 1883, attributed to the Marquess of Bute, in which a version is given different from Greith's, and avoiding its most glaring defects. He adopts the alternative reading 'Petrum.'

'Upon him is built a Church as upon a Peter,
And his apostolate he hath received from God;
The gates of hell do not prevail against him.'

adding, 'The Translation of Ussher and Todd, "upon whom (Patrick) as upon Peter," or "upon whom as upon a second Peter," is opposed to the rule of grammar, which in this case would not admit of "ut Petrus," but would require "ut Petrum." Who can fail to see that in the stanza quoted the Roman mission of S. Patrick is referred to; that the Irish apostle is here represented as sharing the apostleship and mission of S. Peter?'

But he misrepresents Dr. Todd by interpolating the word 'upon' before Peter ('über welchem wie über Petrus'), and therefore the charge of falsehood recoils on himself. The translation referred to needs no justification, but it may be mentioned that the same expression occurs in an Irish comment of the 9th century on 2 Corinthians i. 23, where S. Paul is said to have delayed coming lest he should have to reprove them, *ut Petrus*, i.e. 'as in the case of Peter,' referring no doubt to Galatians ii. 11.

The position of the words 'ut Petrus' renders Greith's translation inadmissible, while the further objection lies against it that it dislocates the stanza and ruins the sense. It is plain that both relatives have 'ecclesia' for their antecedent. The loose way in which writers of his school deal with quotations is shown further on, where, again referring to this verse, he translates it 'whose apostleship he received from Christ.'

The fragments of early Irish literature which have survived the Danish invasions and the civil troubles of later times are few and far between, and only one more document of sufficiently early date remains to be noticed in this inquiry. This is the poem of Fiacc, a bishop of the sixth century, which, though affording no direct support to the Roman mission, has been generally regarded as mentioning a visit of S. Patrick to Italy. The passage referred to is thus given by Dr. Todd, after Colgan :

There is yet another translation, which may be regarded as a curiosity. It appears in the *Life of S. Patrick*, by Miss Cusack, the theological portion of which, she informs us, enjoyed the supervision of the Right Rev. Dr. Moran, now Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney. The following may therefore be credited to him :

'Constant in the service of God, and immovable in the faith of Peter,
Upon whom the Church is built and whose apostolate he received
from God,

Against whose gates the assaults of hell cannot prevail.' P. 563.

Such are the straits to which the Roman theory reduces its advocates. The truth is the Irish Church did not hold the Roman view of S. Matt. xvi. 18, as we shall see further on.

'He went across all Alps (Elpa) beyond the sea; happy was the journey:
He remained with Germain southwards in the south of Leatha (Italy).'

Since this translation was made a great advance has taken place in the knowledge of Old Irish, and Dr. Whitley Stokes, instead of 'beyond the sea,' translates the words (*dé mair*) as an exclamation, 'Great God!' and now Professor Zimmer further amends as follows:

'He (the Angel) conducted him across all Alba (Scotland). Great God! it was a marvel of a journey.
He remained with Germain southward in the south of Leatha (Armorica).'

It was natural that Dr. Todd should have taken *Leatha* to mean Italy, inasmuch as he translated *Elpa* 'the Alps'; but *Letavia*, the 'sea coast territory,' was the mediæval designation of Armorica or Bretagne, and accordingly in the *Mabinogion* we find *Llydaw* as its Welsh designation, and *Lledewic* 'of or belonging to Bretagne.'

In later times the name came to be applied to Italy.

The poem, then, refers not to an expedition of S. Patrick to Italy, but to Gaul, which he reached by crossing Scotland. That he should have chosen this route will appear natural enough if we accept the usual account of his having been born on the banks of the Clyde, at Dumbarton.¹ The native writer, who had evidently never been out of Ireland, regarded the journey through 'the mountainous country' (*Alba*) as a marvellous undertaking.

This interpretation, it may be observed, has the merit of making sense of the statement, hitherto so puzzling, that S. Patrick 'read the canons with Germain in the south of Leatha.' S. Germain's see was in Armorica, not Italy.

From these observations it will be seen that, notwithstanding the ingenuity of the bishop of S. Gall, he has been unable to bring forward a single early authority which, when examined, sustains his contention for the Roman origin of Irish Christianity.

In reviewing the early history of the Irish Church we find the controversy about Easter for a long period occupying the attention of the Irish and Roman clergy. It is not intended here to enter into the merits of the question so fiercely

¹ The traditions of the Irish have preserved two ancient British phrases used by S. Patrick—*Grazacham*, I give thanks, from *gratias ago* (Zeuss, *Gram. Celt.* p. 506), and *Modebrot*, my God of judgment, or my God's judgment.

debated between them, but no sufficient account seems to have been as yet given of the reasons for the strenuous resistance offered by the Irish to a change which was so manifestly desirable, and which was recommended to them by such weighty authority. We must indeed make due allowance for the tenacious adherence to custom natural to a primitive people, but there seems in this case to have been also a principle at stake.

Bæda, who is our principal authority, thinks their obstinacy was the result of mere ignorance; 'no one had acquainted them with the decrees of the Nicene Council.' His opinion rests on the assumption that had they known them they would have yielded, but this is disproved by subsequent events.

It is also not entirely certain that they were unacquainted with them in the time of Columba, for one of the Irish glosses on the Latin hymns in the *Liber Hymnorum* connects him with Cassian of Lerins, as follows: 'Ten (canonical) hours he used to celebrate, as it is reported, and it is from John Cassian's history he took this.'¹ Now Cassian, who had been a monk in Constantinople and came to Lerins in A.D. 410, must have brought thither a knowledge of the First General Council (A.D. 325). This connexion with Cassian, and perhaps through him with Lerins and the south of Gaul, derives probability from a fact mentioned in the recent work of Isaac Taylor on the Alphabet, which is thus referred to in the *Athenæum* of July 28, 1883: 'The splendid Irish uncial to be found in S. Chad's Gospels at Lichfield, and in the incomparable *Book of Kells* in Dublin, is here for the first time explained as a derivation from the fifth-century cursive Latin of Southern Gaul.'

But, however this may be, the case of Columbanus proves that a knowledge of the Nicene decrees did not ensure compliance with them. He was certainly acquainted with the Second General Council, and *a fortiori* he may be assumed to have known the First, and yet no one could be firmer than he in refusing to abandon the national usage.

To understand the position, one fact especially requires to be noted which is too often forgotten. Ireland, unlike Britain, lay outside the Roman Empire; its tribal government and traditions had descended from the remotest times, while all similar Celtic organizations throughout Europe had been broken up by foreign invasion. Its Church was not founded by Rome, and had no intercourse with it for a hundred and

¹ *Goidelica*, by Dr. Whitley Stokes, p. 70.

fifty years. As the Church of the Empire grew on the lines of the Imperial Government, so the Church of Ireland adapted itself to the tribal system which prevailed there. Thus in organization the Churches were wholly unlike, but there was no hostility on the part of the Irish Church to Rome so long as their national customs were not attacked. On the contrary, they respected it as the 'head of Churches' or 'the Head Church,' *i.e.* the principal Church, a phrase not involving in any way the idea of jurisdiction.¹ But even this admission they qualified by making an exception in favour of Jerusalem, the question being merely one of dignity and 'the place of the Lord's resurrection' having the higher claim.

Their respect for Rome was not merely on account of the greatness of the city and its famous history, though these must have loomed large to the imagination of distant communities, but chiefly because it claimed to possess the bodies of S. Peter and S. Paul.

Twice in Columbanus' letter to Pope Boniface IV. reference is made to this, and he asks the Pope to pray 'for him and his fellow-pilgrims at the holy places and where the ashes of the saints repose, and particularly those of S. Peter and S. Paul.' This was the popular belief in the fourth and fifth centuries, when their tombs were shown, one on the Via Ostiensis and the other in the Vatican. It was peculiarly congenial to the Celtic temperament, which has ever delighted to lavish attentions on the departed and to hold their burial places in reverence. A curious memorial of this view of Rome survives in the adoption into the Irish language of the word 'Rome' as a loan-word with the meaning of 'a burial-place.'²

In the course of the discussions about Easter, one observes with interest the tolerant spirit of the Irish Church, in which it almost anticipated the nineteenth century. It sought to impose none of its practices on others; it raised no questions as to theirs. Whatever the Roman clergy affirmed about their Church the Irish accepted, regarding it as a matter in which

¹ The expression is in common use in Ireland at the present day; *e.g.* 'the head physician' in a city is the most eminent in his profession. Professor Zimmer, during his visit to Ireland, observed the stereotyped character of Irish phraseology, and compares, in an amusing way, the address of a beggar to him with that of an Irishman to the Emperor Karl a thousand years before.

² It came to mean, in a secondary sense, 'a city' generally, and in a tertiary sense 'a burial-place,' in which latter sense its use is very common in Old Irish texts. The phrase is sometimes *ruam* or *rom adnaicthe*, 'a city of burial' but generally only *ruam*.

they had no concern, with the sole exception of the claim to authority.

Thus in the discussion at Whitby Colman made no question as to Wilfrid's assertion, unfounded as it was, that S. Peter was the author of the Roman Easter, but simply stated that S. John was the author of theirs. This was sufficient for his purpose. The Roman Easter might, or might not, be of S. Peter's appointment. But to S. Peter in particular the Irish Church owed no allegiance. So, again, when asked whether he admitted that S. Peter had the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, Colman replied in the affirmative, and at first sight seems, according to Bæda's account, to have given up his cause. But this was not the case. He admitted the language used to S. Peter, but the Church to which he belonged refused to accept the Roman interpretation of it.

The prevailing view in Ireland as to the Petrine claims to supremacy, and not merely to a primacy, among the apostles seems to have been the same as Origen's. Origen, indeed, is a writer frequently quoted by Irish authorities. This view is expressed in the *Liber Hymnorum* in the following gloss on the passage of Secundinus already referred to: 'When it is said thou art Peter, &c., it is interpreted, Peter confessing (Christ), Matt. xvi. 16; whosoever therefore desires to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven must acknowledge God by faith, like Peter.'¹

The continued self-assertion of their opponents, however, stirred their Celtic nature, and they proceeded to meet it with counter-assertion, which took the strange form of a rivalry of saints. In the *Book of Leinster* thirty-four foreign saints are equated with natives, and there is a similar list in the Martyrology of Tamlacht in the Burgundian Library at Brussels.

In these lists we have Petrus as representing Patricius, which illustrates the expression 'ut Petrus' already referred to. Then we have Benedict 'caput monachorum totius Europæ' as answering to Fintan Cluain Eidnech, 'caput monachorum totius Hiberniæ,' and so on.

With regard to one name, however, Maria = Brigita, the parallel was carried to strange lengths: for Brigit was said to be 'one of the mothers of our Lord,' or simply 'His mother.'

This was constantly affirmed by Irish missionaries abroad, to the great amazement of their hearers, who did not under-

¹ So also in another gloss of the same work, vol. i., Hymn of S. Cummin Fota; in the Codex Maelbrihte and in Gildas, quoted by Warren, *Celtic Church*, p. 36, note.

stand their realistic treatment of S. Matthew xii. 50. Thus in a satirical poem on the Irish monks at Erfurt, after describing these strange sayings, which the 'vulgus miserum' they were addressed to did not understand, the writer explains what was meant:—

'Accedant scire volentes :
Ex evangelico textu probo quod dico.
"Qui non delinquit, sed qui perfecerat," inquit,
"Velle mei Patris, illum voco nomine fratris ;
Immo meus frater est et soror et mea mater."

Sic Brigidam matrem, Brendanum dicite patrem.'

But a more rational mode of dealing with the Roman claims presented itself when they became acquainted with the Second General Council (Constantinople, A.D. 381) and realized its importance. The Second Canon of this Council permitted Churches without the Empire to observe their own customs, and though its decrees referred primarily to Eastern Churches they were applicable to the only Western Church so situated. Accordingly Columbanus appealed to this Council when urged by the French clergy to conform to the Roman Easter. 'We ask,' he says, 'for permission to observe our own laws according to the regulations made by the 150 fathers of the Council of Constantinople' (Lanigan, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 272).

It is worthy of notice that this Council is mentioned in the *Book of Leinster*, and it is the only foreign Council so noticed, from which we may infer the importance attached to it by the Irish.

They seem to have had a theory not unlike that of Bishop Burnet, whose view was that 'all the Councils held during the existence of the Empire were merely national synods, to which the Christians of Persia, India, or Ethiopia (and Ireland) were not subject' (on Article XXXIV.). Whether this was so or not, in any point of view this Council was the charter of the liberties of all Churches beyond the frontiers of the Empire, and justified the attitude of the Irish Church in its purest days.

The key to the situation, then, evidently is that Ireland, being outside the Empire politically and ecclesiastically, asserted the independence of its Church until the invasions of the northern heathen broke up the schools of learning, scattered the clergy, and destroyed the primitive system of government.

An impartial study of the early history of the Irish Church will scarcely lead to the conclusion Bishop Greith desires.

ART. VI.—LUCA DELLA ROBBIA AND HIS SCHOOL.

1. *Les Della Robbia. Leur Vie et leur Œuvre, d'après des Documents Inédits.* Par J. CAVALLUCCI et EMILE MOLINIER. (Paris, Librairie de l'Art, 1884.)
2. *Die Künstlerfamilie Della Robbia.* Von WILHELM BODE. [*Kunst und Künstler*, herausgegeben von Dr. ROBERT DOHME.] (Leipzig, 1878.)
3. *Vite de' più eccellenti Pittori, Scultori e Architetti.* Scritte da GIORGIO VASARI, con nuovi annotazioni e commenti da GAETANO MILANESI. Tomo ii. (Firenze, 1878.)
4. *Les Della Robbia.* Par H. BARBET DE JOUY. (Paris, 1855.)

On a first visit to Florence, there is perhaps nothing which charms us more than the glazed terra-cottas of Luca della Robbia's invention. These medallions and lunettes of blue and white porcelain, so unlike all other architectural decorations, so unique in their brightness and transparency, seem to meet us everywhere. We see them shining down upon us from under the frowning battlements of mediæval towers or the arcades of ancient hospitals, set in arched recesses over church portals or studding the vaulted roof of choir and side chapel, breaking the monotony of bare stretches of wall and brightening the darkest corners. In the most crowded thoroughfares, amid the din and clatter of the Borgo or the confused cries of the market-place, we look up suddenly and become aware of a gracious Madonna and radiant Child smiling down upon us.

When we leave the streets to climb the heights of San Miniato or of cypress-crowned Fiesole, they are with us still. In many a village church or remote convent shrine we come upon them, whether we wander among the Apennines of Pistoja or wend our way along the green slopes 'watered by a thousand rills' of Dante's Casentino. They abound in the hills of Lucca, in the country round Siena and Volterra, and on the borders of Umbria. In the March of Ancona, on the eastern slope of the Apennines, and in the plains on the way to Rome, they are still to be seen here and there.

And when in England or France or Germany we meet with some isolated specimen of Della Robbia ware in public museums or private collections, nothing more recalls Floren-

tine scenes and Florentine faces than this essentially Tuscan work.

There is a wonderful charm about these delicately coloured reliefs, at once so simple and artless and yet so instinct with profound feeling and ardent devotion. In their purity and finish, in their grace and tenderness, they breathe the very essence of Florentine sculpture; as Burckhardt said, 'they show us the soul of the fifteenth century on its fairest side.'

Of late years this fascinating branch of art has been attentively studied, and the history of the artist family who made the name of Della Robbia illustrious has received several valuable contributions from different quarters. Thirty years ago M. Barbet de Jouy devoted an excellent monograph to the subject, and by his minute and accurate descriptions inspired others with his zeal and enthusiasm. Since then the patient researches of Signor Milanese and of Dr. Bode have added largely to our sources of information, and within the last year Professor Cavallucci and M. Molinier have given us the most complete work which has appeared on the subject. Not only have they thrown light on several important particulars of the family history of the Della Robbias, but they have done good service by separating, as far as it is possible to do so, the works of the three artists Luca, Andrea, and Giovanni, who represent the three different stages of the school. Finally, they have greatly increased the value of their admirable volume by adding a catalogue of their works, which deserves praise as the fullest which has yet appeared, and omits few if any important pieces.

The fashion, still too common in our popular guide-books, of assigning every glazed terra-cotta relief to Luca della Robbia had seriously damaged his reputation as an artist, and the work of the founder of the school had been, as our authors say, 'drowned in the immense mass of his followers' productions.' It is part of their task to restore Luca to his rightful place, and to remind us that he has other and higher claims on our remembrance than the renown which he enjoys as the inventor of the art which bears his name. If he had never discovered 'the secret of making clay eternal,' he would still be numbered among the greatest masters of the Renaissance, and it is as the sculptor of the singing children on the organ gallery of the Duomo that he takes his place by the side of Ghiberti and Donatello. Second only, in vigour and originality, to these two great Florentines who, like himself, stand on the threshold of the fifteenth century, he surpasses both of them in purity of line and finish, while in simplicity,

in sincerity, and in the power of blending ideal conception with the closest imitation of nature, he comes nearer to the perfection of Greek art than any sculptor of the Renaissance.

It is little we know of Luca's life, less even than that of most of the artists whose story Vasari has told. But the few touches with which he fills in his brief outline of the great master's career agree well with the impression we derive from Luca's own works.

We see him there, gifted with a singularly happy and harmonious nature, free alike from the waywardness, the irritability, and the jealousy supposed to be common to artists, scrupulously exact and just in all his dealings, full of generous admiration for his rivals, pleasant and friendly to all about him. We see him leading a frugal and hard-working life, independent of princely patrons, with no other aim but the practice of his art and the education of his brother's children, which, next to his work, he held as his most sacred duty. Last of all we see him at the close of his long life, held in high respect by his fellow-citizens and brother artists, dying full of years and honour in his own home in his native Florence, to whose service he had given the best he had to give. Altogether, a picture which it is good and pleasant to contemplate.

Born in 1399, Luca was the son of Simone della Robbia, a shoemaker, who lived in the Via Egidio, a few doors from the great hospital which Folco Portinari, the father of Dante's Beatrice, founded two hundred years before in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Close by was the square of the Duomo where stood Arnolfo's yet unfinished pile and that tower which had been Giotto's last gift to his native city, with the sculptured stories which ere long Luca himself was to be called upon to complete. And at the other end of the street Lorenzo Ghiberti was even then modelling his famous bronze gates for the Baptistery. Here the boy grew up in the heart of old Florence, and, after receiving a thorough education in all that was held necessary for a youth of his class, was apprenticed to the aged Leonardo di Ser Giovanni, then the best goldsmith in the city. But higher ambitions already stirred his young heart, and he soon left the goldsmith's shop to work in bronze and marble, fired by the example of Lorenzo Ghiberti, who probably gave him his earliest training in art.

Such was the ardour with which young Luca devoted himself to his profession, that Vasari assures us he forgot to eat or sleep, and spent the day in drawing and the night in modelling, careless of cold and hunger. We know nothing of

his earliest works, but by the time he was thirty his talents had attracted the attention of the Medici. On their recommendation he was employed by the administrators of the Cathedral works to execute ten bas-reliefs for the decoration of one of the organ-galleries under that fair cupola which Brunelleschi had just raised to be the wonder of all Florence. The commission for this work, a grand task for any Florentine master, was given to Luca in 1431, and two years later the decoration of the other organ-gallery on the opposite side was assigned to Donatello, then in the height of his fame. During the next eight or nine years Luca worked at these bas-reliefs, and that his employers were satisfied with the result we may infer from the fact that the price of sixty florins originally agreed upon for the larger bas-reliefs was raised to seventy in consideration of the time and labour expended on them.

Vasari, who saw both sets of bas-reliefs in their places on the organ-galleries of the Duomo, speaks with admiration of the marvellous finish bestowed by Luca upon his work, while he considers the greater freedom and ruder character of Donatello's marbles as a proof of the elder sculptor's experience. It is easy to believe that Donatello's reliefs may have been more effective when seen on the balustrade of the gallery at a great height from the ground: but we who see them on the floor of the Bargello Museum can hardly think of comparing the two series. Both are fine works, worthy of the men who designed them and of the place they occupied; but while we may admire the boldness of Donatello's strokes and the Bacchanalian frenzy which seems to inspire his dancing genii, we turn back with ever-increasing wonder to gaze on the exquisite perfection of Luca's marble forms. These happy children standing or sitting in careless ease with their varied instruments in their hands, these fair-faced boys and maidens blowing long trumpets, sounding their harp and lyre, or clashing their cymbals as they go, singing all the while for gladness of heart, breathe the very spirit of music. Not a detail is left out, not a touch forgotten. We see the motion of their hands beating time as they bend over each other's shoulders to read the notes, the rhythmic measure of their feet as they circle hand in hand to the tune of their own music, the very swelling of their throats as, with heads thrown back and parted lips, they pour forth their whole soul in song. Never was the innocent beauty, the unconscious grace, of childhood more perfectly rendered than in these lovely bands of curly-headed children thrilled through and through with the power and the joy of the melody.

Long before these immortal works had left Luca's workshop, fresh commissions came in from all sides. Once more he and Donatello were required to compete for the execution of a colossal head to be placed on the top of Brunelleschi's cupola, and when this project was abandoned for lack of funds a joint commission was given them to carve two altars for the chapels of S. Peter and S. Paul in the Duomo. Again, however, the money was not forthcoming; and while Donatello never even attempted his share of the task, Luca only carved two unfinished bas-reliefs of the Crucifixion and Deliverance of S. Peter from prison, fine fragments bearing strong marks of Ghiberti's influence, now preserved in the Bargello.

It is pleasant to learn that Luca, who was so often brought into competition with Donatello, had the greatest admiration for his illustrious rival, and inspired his own nephew Andrea with the same veneration. Long after Luca was dead, and when Andrea himself was old, he often spoke with enthusiasm of the old master, and told young Giorgio Vasari with pride that he had been present at the great Donatello's funeral, 'of which,' writes the Aretine, 'I remember the good old man was as proud as possible.' In May 1437 Luca was entrusted with a still more honourable task, the execution of the five lozenge-shaped bas-reliefs which were still wanting to complete the series representing the progress of civilization on the base of Giotto's tower. All five were copied from Giotto's own designs, and, saving for the sharpness and clearness of the work, and the loving care with which every leaf of the foliage is carved, have little in common with Luca's finer style. We recognize the humour of the great painter in the angry disputants who represent Logic, and the lazy duck, 'sleepily delighted after its muddy dinner,' who listens to the soul-subduing strains of Orpheus.

But the longest and most laborious task on which Luca was employed in Sta. Maria del Fiore was the execution of the bronze doors of the sacristy under the organ-gallery. These had been originally assigned to Donatello in 1437, and it was not until 1446 that the administrators of the Duomo works, tired of waiting the master's pleasure, gave Luca the commission. Even then many difficulties had yet to be encountered. Michelozzo was two years casting the bronze for the doors, and another five years had passed before the sculptor, Maso, who was employed on the mouldings of the framework, had ended his share of the task. We find Luca still engaged in carving the panels in 1464, and he did not

receive his final payment of seven hundred florins until ten years later.

The general design of these bronze doors resembles that of Ghiberti's gates, but the treatment is less pictorial and remarkable for a severity and perfect symmetry more akin to classical art. In the upper panel of one door the Madonna and Child are represented, on the other the risen Lord, each between adoring angels that remind us of the Pisani's reliefs at Orvieto. The eight other panels contain sitting figures of the Evangelists and doctors of the Church with attendant angels in Luca's best manner, while small heads, carved with the utmost skill and delicacy, fill the small medallions at the corners of each relief.

Before Luca had even begun to work at these gates he had already entered on the second period of his career, and had, in Vasari's words, enriched the world by another art, *nuova, utile e bellissima*. His fertile genius ever seeking for new means of expression could not rest content with the slow production of works in bronze and marble. Some easier, less costly material was needed for the more prompt and spontaneous expression of those countless forms of beauty which thronged upon his vision, and it is Luca's glory to have discovered an art exactly suited to his wants.

It has been sometimes supposed that, as Vasari intimates, Luca della Robbia was the first to apply a glaze of enamel to pottery; but this is a mistake, as long before his time majolica was manufactured in Italy. On the other hand, there seems little doubt that he was the first to apply this stanniferous enamel to works of sculpture in terra cotta, and thus give to the clay he moulded the charms of transparency and brightness, while at the same time he rendered it durable enough to resist many centuries of exposure to the air.

How long he laboured and how many times he failed in his experiments we do not learn, but by 1441 his success was complete, for in that year he was commanded to make a relief of the Resurrection in glazed terra cotta for the oval lunette above the sacristy of the Duomo. There the work is still to be seen to-day: in the upper part the risen Christ bearing the flag of victory and attended by rejoicing angels; below, the Roman guards, admirably lifelike figures, slumbering round the lifted stone and open tomb. Here the figures are white on a blue ground, and little other colour is introduced; but in the relief of the Ascension which occupies the lunette above the other sacristy, executed by Luca three years afterwards,

green and brown and yellow are all employed to throw out the principal figures and avoid confusion.

In the contract for this relief the colours to be used are specified, and it is expressly said, '*mons sit sui coloris, arbores etiam sui coloris*'—a fact which sufficiently refutes the old idea that Luca confined himself solely to blue and white. It is true that, as a rule, his figures are white, and that he employed other colours only for the subordinate parts of the picture, while the tones he uses are more delicate than those of his later followers; but both in the five Evangelists on the cupola of the Cappella dei Pazzi at Santa Croce, and in the vaulting of the Cardinal of Portugal's chapel up at San Miniato, we find green and violet, black and yellow, freely introduced.

In the two reliefs of the Duomo we feel that Luca has already mastered his art. The glaze is admirably laid on, the heads of the kneeling Apostles who watch the ascending Lord are full of wistful and ardent devotion, but there is a certain stiffness and formality in the grouping, partly arising no doubt from the difficulty of introducing all the twelve Apostles and the Virgin, as stipulated in the contract, into this narrow space. Luca is more at home, the charm which was his special gift is more felt, in such works as the Madonnas in the Via S. Agnolo and on the portals of S. Pierino, the old church of which Pucci sings, at the corner of the Mercato Vecchio.

Both, it is evident, are among his early works in terra cotta, both are set in those garlands of richly coloured flowers and foliage which he loves to represent in all their wealth and variety of hue; but while a simple wreath of jessamine and wild convolvulus surrounds the one, the other is encircled with thick clusters of mingled flowers and fruit. Again, two Angels holding tall white lilies in vases stand on either side of one Virgin, while winged cherubs float about the other and bend adoring eyes on the fair Child clasped in His Mother's arms. Each lunette has a distinct character of its own, and it is hard to know which is fairest, the more royal and stately Virgin of the Via S. Agnolo, or the sweet Madonna who smiles down in her divine graciousness on the buyers and sellers of the old market-place. We feel as we look at these masterpieces of art how admirably the fragile clay lent itself to the expression of Luca's delicate feeling, and how truly these works reflect the innate grace and beauty of his soul.

Every day the new art became more popular with the Florentines, and Luca was called upon to adorn one building after another. He still worked for the Duomo, and in 1448 made two statues of kneeling angels in white enamel, holding

candelabra in their hands, which are preserved in the Canons' Sacristy, and are worthy of notice as the only specimens of the kind we have from his hand. In the same year he modelled a *puttino* for a hall in the Palazzo Vecchio, and between 1449 and 1452 he completed a lunette for a Dominican church at Urbino, on which Maso, his assistant in the bronze gates, was then engaged. This relief, a Madonna and Saints, in his most charming manner, is the only work which Luca is known to have executed for any place without the walls of Florence, although Vasari speaks, in his careless fashion, of reliefs and statues sent by him to Spain and Naples.

His blue and white medallions with the arms of the Signory and the Builders' Guild still brighten the grim old walls of Or San Michele, the Corn-merchants' hall, transformed into a church a century before Luca's time, and adorned with statues by all the Florentine guilds in turn. There, exactly above the famous S. George of his old rival, Donatello, he placed our Lady of the Flower, clad in a many-coloured robe, with the lilies of Florence at her side, for all passers-by to see and reverence.

The new and popular art was not exclusively employed to adorn churches, and several Florentine palaces were decorated with shields and medallions by the hand of Luca. His masterpiece in this line was Piero de' Medici's studio, a small room which he decorated entirely, from the ceiling to the floor, with reliefs and enamelled tiles, 'a rare thing,' says Vasari, 'and very useful for the summer time.' Filarete, writing in 1464, speaks with admiration of this writing-cabinet which he was shown in the Medici Palace, adding that it is the work of the Florentine sculptor, Luca della Robbia.

A large medallion, emblazoned with the armorial bearings of the Pazzi family, is still to be seen in Palazzo Quaratesi in the Borgo degli Albizzi, and another bearing the arms of King René of Anjou, executed for the same patrons to commemorate Jacopo de' Pazzi receiving knighthood at his hands, is now at South Kensington. In the same collection are twelve majolica plates on which the months of the year are represented in two shades of blue, which are supposed to have originally belonged to Piero de' Medici's studio, but ingenious and interesting as they are, we agree with MM. Cavallucci and Molinier that their execution shows little affinity with Luca's work, and cannot be accepted as his in the absence of positive proof.

Occasionally we find Luca still working in marble as well as in terra cotta, and both are happily blended together in

two examples which have been preserved in the environs of Florence. One is the tabernacle bearing a marble relief of a Pietà surrounded by a terra-cotta frieze, executed in 1442 for the chapel of S. Luke in the hospital of Santa Maria Nuova, and now in a church at the village of Peretola. The other is the tomb of Benozzo Federighi, Bishop of Fiesole, in the church of S. Francesco di Paola, at the foot of Bello Sguardo hill. The bishop is represented after the fashion of sepulchral monuments of the age, lying on a marble sarcophagus adorned with flying angels holding a crown between them. Above is a half-length figure of Christ rising from the tomb with the Virgin and S. John on either side, and the whole is framed in by a frieze of enamelled tiles, on which bouquets of lilies and roses, mingled with clusters of pears and medlars and fir cones, are painted on a flat surface. '*Cosa maravigliosa e rarissima!*' exclaims Vasari, who says with truth that the hues of both fruit and flowers are as natural and brilliant as if they had been painted in oils.

Luca's powers and industry showed no falling off as he advanced in years, and the vaulting of the chapel of S. Jacopo at San Miniato, executed when he was past sixty, is the finest and most complete scheme of roof decoration which he ever accomplished. Already in 1448, at the bidding of Piero de' Medici, he had supplied an ornamental canopy of white rosettes on a blue ground for Michelozzo's chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, the curious little shrine resting on four columns at the foot of the raised choir in this noble basilica. Now he was required to decorate the mortuary chapel erected in 1459 at the end of the left aisle, to contain the ashes of that model of all virtue, the young Cardinal of Portugal, whose early death at the age of twenty-six had been the cause of such universal lamentation. Here, above the tomb on which the dead youth sleeps, guarded by angel-watchers, Luca placed five medallions of pale blue on a richly patterned ground. The central one held the dove of the Holy Ghost surrounded by seven golden candlesticks, while on the four others were youthful angels bearing symbols of those virtues, Temperance, Justice, Prudence, and Fortitude, which had been so brightly set forth in the young Cardinal's short life.

These finely designed and animated figures were not completed till 1466, and are the last work of Luca's of which any record remains. Five years afterwards he was elected head of the Artists' Guild, but declined to accept this honour, the greatest to which a Florentine master could aspire, on the score of his great age and increasing infirmities.

In 1446, about the time that his glazed terra-cotta work first became famous, he had bought a house in the Via Guelfa, where he spent the remainder of his life with his two orphaned nephews, Andrea and Simone, the sons of his only brother, Marco. Since he had never married himself, he adopted them as his own children, and while Simone followed his father's and grandfather's trade, Andrea had been trained by his uncle in his own art and was already a distinguished sculptor. To him Luca left, as his most precious possession, the practice of the art which he had invented, while to Simone he bequeathed the whole of his modest fortune. His reasons for this division are fully explained in the quaintly worded will which, being *sanus mente, sensu, corpore, visu et intellectu*, he made on February 19, 1471. Since he had in his lifetime taught Andrea his art, while he had never taught Simone anything, since the practice of the said art which Andrea inherited from Luca was sufficiently remunerative to support his family honourably, and all the goods Luca had were not equal to this art which Andrea had received as a gift from Luca, and since it is well that Simone should have his share and that no one should be able to reproach him, Luca, with injustice, he now leaves all his remaining fortune to the said Simone, his nephew.

By the same will Luca left one hundred gold florins to his widowed niece, Cecca, the only sister of Andrea and Simone, and bequeathed certain of his works, perhaps as yet unpaid for, to Sta. Maria del Fiore.

After this he lived eleven more years in the same house as his nephews, who were both married and had children of their own. At length, on February 20, 1482, he passed away, and was buried in his own sepulchre in the church of S. Pietro Maggiore, leaving the memory of a noble life without a stain from beginning to end, of a long roll of great works to be the glory of his native Florence. The pains which he had spent on his nephew's training had already met with their reward, and when he closed his eyes on this world, he had the satisfaction of knowing that he left a successor well fitted to continue his work and perpetuate the name which he had made illustrious.

Born in 1435, Andrea had married when he was about thirty, and in the tax-papers of 1470 he had already three children by his wife Nanna, aged twenty-one. He led the same simple, hard-working life as his uncle before him, never leaving the old house, where he reared seven sons to be his helpers. During the ninety years of his long lifetime the

new art enjoyed an ever-increasing popularity, and attained a fuller development than ever before. It was now applied with great success to a number of different objects. Altars of every size and description, lavatories, friezes, statues, and shields issued in countless numbers from the workshop of the Via Guelfa.

While Luca's activity had been almost entirely confined to Florence, Andrea's works are to be found not only in every part of Tuscany, but among all the cities and convents of Umbria and Romagna. Unlike his uncle he never attempted great works in bronze or marble. A single exception to this rule exists in the altar of Sta. Maria delle Grazie at Arezzo, where reliefs and statuettes of saints and angels of coloured marbles are introduced. Even here the style of workmanship and the taste for elaborate decoration are essentially characteristic of the worker in terra cotta.

Inferior to Luca in power and grandeur of conception, Andrea is none the less an artist of exquisite taste and feeling, whose work reflects the tendencies of the latter half of the fifteenth century, just as Luca inherits the traditions of a simpler and severer age. The celestial sweetness of his youthful Madonnas reminds us of Mino da Fiesole, and sometimes of his contemporary Filippino, whose Nativity his own roundels often resemble, while his saints' heads have all the impassioned fervour of Perugino at his best.

A number of his Madonnas formerly to be found in the churches and convents of Florence have been brought together in the Bargello and Academy of Arts, and bear witness to the inexhaustible fertility of Andrea's invention. We see the Virgin Mother in every variety of attitude, standing, sitting, kneeling in adoration of her Child, clasping Him to her breast, or nursing Him in her arms, while fair angel-boys place a crown on her brows, and God the Father or the two hands and dove which symbolize the Trinity, appear in the clouds, surrounded by a glory of cherubs. Or else he works on a larger scale, as in the great altar-pieces described by Vasari at Arezzo, or that at Rocca di Gradara, near Pesaro, where the Virgin appears enthroned and surrounded by attendant saints, with a predella on which the Annunciation, Nativity, and Adoration of the Magi are represented. In the Chiesa degli Angioli at Assisi, and again in the convent of the Osservanza, near Siena, the Coronation of the Virgin is the subject of the altar-piece, and troops of those angels which Andrea loved hover in the clouds playing their instruments of music. Another good example of this class is the Adoration of the

Magi in the South Kensington Museum, where the portrait of the painter Perugino is introduced among the attendants of the three kings. This fine work bears the arms of the Albizzi family, who, like Andrea himself, were among the most devoted followers of Savonarola.

Alone of all his school, Andrea confined himself exclusively to blue and white, only using green for his trees and grass, and sometimes a soft grey in the background, while in a few instances the aureoles about his saints' heads are of gold. Another characteristic feature of his reliefs is the framework which surrounds them. Luca's works, or at least those of his period, are framed either with a simple moulding or else with a garland of fruit and flowers. The greatest variety appears in these festoons, in which strawberries, their blossoms, pomegranates, citrons, oranges, medlars, water-melons, vine leaves, and grapes are mingled with flowers of every hue, and the dark spikes of the fir-tree with its red-brown cones and the brighter foliage of the oak are frequently introduced with excellent effect, the leaf always corresponding exactly to the flower or fruit.

Andrea also often makes use in his earlier works of this decoration which Luca had turned to such admirable account, and on one of his finest Madonnas, executed for the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, known as the Bertello, he surrounds his relief with a framework of single sunflowers. But later on, the decoration of his larger altars assumes a more distinctly Renaissance character. They are framed in with pilasters adorned with candelabra and arabesques, or bouquets of flowers and festoons starting out of vases of classical form, while an elegant moulding, or more commonly a frieze of cherub heads, runs along the top. These tiny faces are a favourite motive of Andrea, who is never weary of repeating these dimpled cheeks and curly heads, which in their perfect grace and truthfulness come very near to Raphael's own. No one who knows Florence can forget the row of babies with which he adorned the arcades of the Hospital of the Innocents on the piazza of the Annunziata. Wrapped in their swaddling clothes, these innocents turn their baby faces towards us, and reach out their arms or lift their imploring eyes, as if to ask our compassion, or to speak their thanks for the charity which has kept them alive. No two of the series are alike: some have broken loose in their playfulness from the bands that held them, while others look sad and wistful, but all fourteen are living examples of infant loveliness in its most winning form. Within the cloister is another of

Andrea's best works, a lunette of the Annunciation, with a flowering lily standing in a pot between Mary and the kneeling Archangel, set in a frieze of cherub heads, each different one from the other.

Another hospital which Andrea decorated was that of S. Paolo, opposite the church of Sta. Maria Novella. Here he placed, along the Loggia built in 1490, seven medallions containing figures of saints and of Our Lord healing the sick, and a fine lunette, the Embrace of S. Francis and S. Dominic, in graceful allusion to the benevolence of a Dominican archbishop, S. Antonio, to whom this Franciscan institution in a great measure owed its existence. The dark Franciscan garb is finely contrasted with the white tunic of the Dominicans, and the yearning love in the face of Francis as he presses forward to meet the founder of the rival order, is very beautiful.

It would be impossible to enumerate one half of the altars or lunettes which Andrea executed for the convents and confraternities of Florence and the neighbourhood, and we can only take a passing glance at those magnificent works of his which still adorn the great Franciscan sanctuary on the desolate heights of La Vernia,

'Nel crudo sasso intra Tevere ed Arno.'

On these barren rocks, high above the upper valley of the Arno, we find Andrea's reliefs to-day as fresh and bright as they were three hundred years ago, when Vasari declared that no painting could possibly last even a year or two in this desert region.

The convent church of this renowned sanctuary had been completed in 1459, chiefly owing to the liberality of the wool merchants of Florence, who had taken the community under their protection, and between 1460 and 1500 many wealthy citizens adorned the chapels with altars in glazed terra cotta. Among a dozen works or more of the kind in the different churches and chapels of La Vernia, four at least bear traces of Andrea's hand. The great church contains one of his sweetest Nativities, together with an Annunciation very like the lunette of the Spedale degli Innocenti; in the Chiesina we have a large relief of the Madonna giving the measure of the chapel to S. Bonaventura, dated 1486; while the Chapel of the Stigmata—the Holy of Holies—has a grand Crucifixion, the finest rendering of the subject in Della Robbia art. The heads of the saints, S. John, S. Benedict, and others, at the foot of the cross, are unequalled in beauty of expression; that of Francis.

himself in its intensity of yearning reminds us of S. Giovanni Gualberto in Perugino's Vallombrosa altar-piece, and every shade of grief and wonder is displayed in the gestures and faces of the angels hiding their eyes and clasping their hands wildly together as they hover round the dying Lord. Nowhere does Andrea better reveal the depths of feeling that lived in his gentle breast—never before had terra cotta been used to express passion so profound or emotions of so varied and subtle a nature.

After Luca's death Andrea was employed on works for the Duomo which have for the most part perished. In 1489 he finished a beautiful lunette for the Duomo of Prato, in which, as Dr. Bode remarks, the heads of the martyr saints, Stephen and Laurence, so closely resemble those of La Vernia, probably executed a year or two before. Two years later he completed a frieze of garlands and medallions for Sta. Maria delle Carceri in the same town, and a fine group of the Visitation at Pistoja may belong to this period.

He was back at Florence soon afterwards, working at the Convalescent Hospital of S. Paolo, and both he and his sons were witnesses of that great religious revival by which Savonarola made the close of the fifteenth century memorable. The whole of Andrea's family, we learn from Vasari, were deeply attached to the Friar of San Marco, and, like so many of the best Florentine artists, devoted their art to his cause. More than this, two of Andrea's sons—Marco, the eldest, and Paolo—took the vows, and received the Dominican habit at the hands of Fra Girolamo himself. In that terrible night, when the faithful Piagnoni rallied round S. Mark's, three of Andrea's sons were among the defenders of the convent, and the best account we have of those last sad scenes was given by Fra Luca, otherwise known as Marco della Robbia, in his examination before Savonarola's judges. He it is who describes how, as night closed on that anxious day, the little band of armed monks met in the church, and how the Frate, standing calm and unmoved in their midst with the Sacrament in his hands, bade them lay down their arms; how, too, some of them disobeyed his word, and he among the rest struck wildly with his sword at the furious mob who rushed in to seize their victim.

We know that it was all in vain, that Fra Luca and his brave friends were overpowered, and that Savonarola died. But the Della Robbias were among the faithful Piagnoni who revered his memory to the last, and we learn from Vasari that they commemorated his name in medals, bearing Savo-

narola's head on one side, and on the other a fortified city with the sword of the Lord descending upon her, as he had prophesied.

It is curious to find that in the year 1501, at the very time when Baccio della Porta was forsaking the world in his despair to take refuge in Fra Girolamo's convent, and leaving his fresco of the Last Judgment to be finished by another, Andrea della Robbia was engaged on the self-same subject in the church of S. Girolamo at Volterra. It was a scene which he had rarely, if ever, been employed to represent, but the work is a noble one based partly on Orcagna and partly on Fra Angelico's well-known pictures. In the upper part Christ appears between two angels sounding trumpets; below, in the foreground, S. Michael stands with drawn sword, and at his feet a kneeling youth, on whose face a smile of beatitude is breaking. All around, the dead are seen struggling up out of their tombs, on the right angels are embracing monks, and the blessed walk hand-in-hand in the grassy meadows and leafy bowers of Paradise, while on the left the lost, among whom is a bishop, perhaps one of Fra Girolamo's persecutors, are seen howling amid rocky caverns and precipices.

In these his last years the aged sculptor executed several works for the Dominicans to whom he was bound by so many ties. He adorned an altar in the church of S. Mark itself with a Virgin crowned by angels as she adores the Child, who smiles back at her from his bed at the foot of a tall white lily. For the monks of La Quercia at Viterbo he accomplished several important works between 1498 and 1514; and a Madonna, his last work of all, was destined for Pian di Mugnone, a house in the country belonging to the monks of S. Mark. This was finished in 1515, when he was already eighty years old—the fine old man whom young Vasari remembered, and whose portrait Andrea del Sarto painted for us in the portico of the Annunziata Church, exactly opposite that Loggia which he had decorated some fifty years before with his frieze of Innocents. Ten years after that he died on the 4th of August 1525, and was buried by the side of his uncle and master, the great Luca, in the ruined church of S. Pietro Maggiore.

Of the seven sons whom Andrea left, no less than four became distinguished artists. Paolo, or Fra Ambrogio as he was known in religion, has left us a fine example of his work in a Presepio at the Dominican convent of S. Spirito at Siena, where he spent some months in 1504. The heads of Joseph and the two shepherds, who with Mary compose the

group, are remarkably good and lifelike, but the general execution, especially the glazing, is of inferior quality. Afterwards he seems to have assisted his younger brother Luca in the pavement of the Loggie of the Vatican, which they executed under Raphael's direction in 1518.

But it was Andrea's second son, Giovanni, born May 8, 1469, who became the chief representative of the school in Florence. The lavatory in the sacristy of Sta. Maria Novella, which he finished in 1497, gives us a high idea of the young man's powers. It is made on the same pattern as Andrea's altars, supported by pilasters adorned with arabesques, and encircled by a festoon of fruit upheld by four cherubs. A lunette of the Madonna and Angels, in a frame of white rosettes on a blue ground, fills the upper part, and in the recess behind the basin a charming riverside scene with village trees and tall campanile is represented in coloured tiles.

Andrea's influence is strongly felt in this masterpiece of decorative art, but unfortunately Giovanni, when left to himself, soon lost sight of his father's more ideal tendency. His two great tabernacles in the Bargello and in the Via Nazionale, dated 1521 and 1522, bear marked symptoms of decadence. The figures are coarsely modelled, the colouring overdone, the flesh and even the eyes are tinted, and the multiplication of details only serves to obscure the chief features of the picture. In his anxiety to produce effect Giovanni seems to have piled up all the different motives invented by his predecessors, and gives us elaborate mouldings and friezes of cherub heads and heavy festoons of fruit and flowers in the same altar-piece. He loads his pilasters with a profusion of ornament, with heads of satyrs and dolphins, griffins and cornucopias, in the most tasteless fashion. Sometimes, as in the tabernacle of the Via Nazionale, he introduces cherub heads in high relief, starting out of the garlands, and in another example at Lamporecchio scenes from the Passion are worked in relief on the framework. All sense of repose is lost, and there is an entire absence of that charm which is so remarkable in both Luca's and Andrea's work.

At the same time the glazing bears traces of hasty execution and want of finish, and there is a marked decline of originality. Not only do we find the same motives repeated in the terra cottas which issued from Giovanni's atelier in the first thirty years of the sixteenth century, but whole figures and subjects are copied from the works of other masters. Thus Verrocchio's famous bronze group of the doubting S. Thomas on the walls of Or San Michele is reproduced in a

large relief in white enamel in S. Jacopo di Ripoli, and the same master's picture of the Baptism of Our Lord is copied on a font executed in 1511 for the church of S. Leonardo at Cerreto Guidi. This last work, an hexagonal font of considerable elegance in the details and ornament, is also entirely covered with the cold white enamel employed in some works of this period, while an excessive use of colour marred the effect of others. No doubt many of these inferior reliefs were the work of Giovanni's assistants and scholars, and it is probable, as Vasari indeed affirms, that the secret of making glazed terra cotta was no longer the exclusive property of the Della Robbia family. Certainly imitators had sprung up in the district round Siena, where the reliefs of this kind bear a distinctly Siennese character, and in some instances the names of the artists have been preserved.

In this general decadence it is refreshing to find one work of undoubted originality and beauty. This is the frieze of the Hospital del Ceppo at Pistoja, by Giovanni della Robbia. The authorship of this great work had been frequently discussed, not without a strong presumption in our master's favour, since it appeared impossible that so important a series should issue from any other workshop at that time; but all doubts have been now set at rest by Signor Milanesi's discovery of an entry in the archives of the hospital, in which Giovanni d' Andrea della Robbia is mentioned as being employed there between 1525 and 1529.

The Loggia of the hospital was erected between 1514 and 1525 under the government of Monsignor Leonardo Buonafede, the wise and benevolent Spedalingo of Sta. Maria Nuova of Florence, and the frieze seems to have been executed at the expense of this generous Carthusian monk. It is evident that different artists were employed on the work, and Giovanni was probably assisted by his sons and a certain scholar named Santi Buglioni, whose name also appears in the archives. The medallions between the arches bearing reliefs of the Annunciation, Visitation, and Assumption, the arms of the hospital and of the Medici, are of very inferior quality; but above the arcade, running along the whole front of the hospital is a very fine frieze of bas-reliefs some four feet high, representing the Seven Works of Mercy. These are divided by full-length figures of virtues which bear considerable resemblance to some of Giovanni's statues elsewhere. In the same way we notice a certain awkwardness in the folds of the drapery on the figures of the long reliefs which remind us of his earlier work. But in all other respects the frieze of

the Ceppo is immeasurably superior. The colour is admirably laid on and skilfully distributed, the grouping and action of the full-length figures are excellent, and many of the scenes recall the paintings of Andrea del Sarto and of Fra Bartolommeo.

Here Giovanni, it is plain, had a work which interested him, a task infinitely better suited to his more realistic taste than the worn-out themes he had been engaged upon until now. He had a story to tell, and he has told it well, with no mean share of dramatic power and animation. It may be, as MM. Cavallucci and Molinier suggest, and as some reliefs ascribed to him at South Kensington seem to show, that he had within the last few years learnt much from the study of antique patterns, and was, as it were, entering on a new phase of his artistic career. But whatever the cause to which we owe this improvement, it is visible in every figure of the six reliefs before us—the seventh was added in a similar style by a Pistojan artist sixty years later. These beggars with their rags and their grotesque faces, these men and women of the people in their work-a-day clothes, these hungry children clinging to the skirts of the fat Dominican monk who holds out loaves of bread to satisfy their clamour, these wretched sufferers groaning on their low pallets as kindly bishop and priest move among them on their errand of mercy, are as human and as true to life as anything in Florentine art. Every detail is given in the most graphic manner. The scene of visiting the sick is evidently copied from the interior of the hospital, the very number of the beds, the uneasy postures of the patients being depicted with almost painful reality; while in the last scene of all, the wailing friends who bend over the dead man's bed, the forms of priest and choristers who stand by with cross and taper to discharge the last offices of religion, are represented in the same singularly real and lifelike fashion.

The effect of the whole frieze as an external decoration is equally happy. Its vivid yet delicate colouring lends ever-fresh brightness to the brown arcades of the old loggia at the foot of the purple Apennines, and gives the sunny piazza of the little Tuscan town a place among our pleasantest recollections.

Never before this time had Luca's art been applied on so large a scale to architectural decoration, and had Giovanni lived longer the world might have witnessed a new departure in the history of Della Robbia work. But, in the very midst of a task so congenial to his genius, a crushing blow overtook

him in the loss of his three sons, Marco, Lucantonio, and Simone, all young men, says Vasari, of the greatest promise, who all three died in the year 1527 of the plague. Two years later Giovanni himself died, leaving the frieze of the Ceppo to be finished by another hand.

None of all Andrea's sons were now left to take his place and continue his work in Florence. Two of them had died young, two more were in the convent, and, if they were still alive, seem to have ceased to work in terra cotta, while the two remaining ones had left their native land.

For about the time of Andrea's death Girolamo, his youngest son, had gone to France, where he became court architect to Francis I., and enjoyed that monarch's favour in so high a degree that he induced his brother Luca to follow him and enter the service of the same munificent patron.

Besides adorning the châteaux of Fontainebleau and Orleans with many works in bronze, in marble, and terra cotta, Girolamo built his royal master a palace, known as the Château de Madrid, in the Bois de Boulogne, 'after the Italian fashion, with open arcades and terraces up to the roof.' This he decorated with terra-cotta medallions and pilasters and festoons, both within and without, and Evelyn, who saw it in 1650, speaks of 'statues and relievos, chimney-pieces and columns, painted like porcelain or china ware, whose colours appear very fresh.' After that, the wonderful fabric was allowed to fall into decay, and perished in the French Revolution, when the exquisite garlands and mouldings of the Florentine master were broken into pieces and used to mend the streets of Paris.

Girolamo himself returned to Florence after the death of King Francis and his own brother Luca, about the year 1553. But his old friends were dead, and the place was too much changed for him to care to remain there. In a few years he returned to France, where his children settled and married into French families, and where he himself died in 1566, his last work being the funereal effigy of Catherine de' Medici.

So, Vasari remarks sadly, the house of the Della Robbia in Florence remained closed, their artist race extinct; and although a few imitators prolonged the life of the expiring school feebly down to the end of the century, the art which Luca and Andrea and Giovanni had made illustrious during the space of a hundred years was no more.

ART. VII.—THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

1. *The Outlines of the Christian Ministry.* By CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.C.L., Bishop of S. Andrew's, Fellow of Winchester College. (London, 1872.)
2. *A Father in Christ.* A Sermon preached in S. Paul's Cathedral on the Feast of S. Mark the Evangelist, 1885, By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., Canon of S. Paul's. Second edition, with a notice of the Rev. Dr. Hatch's Paper in the *Contemporary Review*, June 1885. (London, 1885.)

NINETEEN years have elapsed since Bishop Charles Wordsworth undertook to 'bring the outlines of the Christian ministry to the test of Reason, Holy Scripture, History, and Experience, with a view to the reconciliation of existing differences concerning it, especially between Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism.' It was a gallant, not to say Quixotic, enterprise, being nothing less than an attempt to convert the Scotch Establishment by demonstrating the claims of the Catholic priesthood. The demonstration was complete, but we hear of no conversions. Scotch Presbyterians are 'locked up in adamant' against demonstrations; Cardinal Manning could not be more sublimely contemptuous of Church history. They care not a straw for Catholic unity; they are rather proud of their schism; it shows their superiority to the rest of Christendom. As for Reason and Scripture, Presbyterian logic has always a strong flavour of Jedburgh; it forms its conclusions first and fishes for premisses afterwards. The Westminster Assembly first subscribed the Solemn League and Covenant against prelacy, and then resolved to inquire into the form of government most agreeable to God's Holy Word. The Bishop of S. Andrew's quotes a letter from one of the Scotch commissioners, absolutely declining to be associated with anyone 'having the least tincture of episcopacy or liturgic learning.'

Experience, indeed, Scotland now has in abundance. The Establishment has learned something from the secession of the Free Kirk. It was said at a presbytery in 1870, 'We are beginning to feel the *inexpediency* of schism; we shall next feel its *sinfulness*.'¹ The evils of separation are a frequent theme in the General Assemblies of both, and with good

¹ Bishop Wordsworth, p. 206 n.

cause, seeing that no less than *fourteen* distinct Presbyterian 'churches' jostle one another in Scotland, without the least perceptible difference of doctrine or discipline, besides Baptists, Independents, Wesleyans, Quakers, &c. Still, every Presbyterian minister is bound at his ordination to abjure 'prelacy.' They may proselytize from one another; they may take refuge in the omnipotence of the Papacy; but they are bound to turn a deaf ear to a Church that offers nothing but argument and hesitates to drive the argument *home*. The Bishop declines to challenge the 'validity' of Presbyterian orders. He shrinks from 'unchurching' communities enjoying much spiritual benefit from the ministrations of their choice. His grievance is, that he and others are debarred from the advantages of a national Establishment. It is obvious for the Kirk to retort by demanding why he brings his English orders into Scotland, disturbing a ministry as 'valid' as his own, established by law, and more acceptable to the people? The curse of Scotland is overchurching, not unchurching. The multiplication of sects is acknowledged to be 'one of the chief barriers' to the power of Christianity.¹ The great towns complain that pauperism and spiritual destitution grow with the growth of rival churches.² The Sunday Schools are killed by the 'keen competition' for the children.³ The sole justification of the Anglican Communion is the apostolical succession of the episcopate.⁴

This has always been the weak point with English Churchmen; they are so afraid of 'unchurching' others that they go near to unchurch themselves. The late Archbishop Tait 'could hardly imagine there were two bishops on the Bench, or one clergyman in fifty, who would deny the validity of the orders of Presbyterian clergymen solely on account of

¹ *Report, General Assembly, 1870.* Wordsworth, p. 257 n.

² *Glasgow Herald, 1870.* *Ib.* 239 n.

³ *Edinburgh Courier, 1869.* *Ib.* 248 n.

⁴ The Bishop has lately addressed a letter to the *Times*, suggesting that some attempt should be made to find a common ground of defence for the legal Establishment in the two countries; a plan which, the Editor truly observes, 'must wear an unpleasant appearance of being an alliance in defence of the loaves and fishes.' A Scottish bishop, writing in the *Guardian*, concurs in this objection, but adds the yet more mysterious hint that 'the alliance should be made to rest not upon the mere fact of Establishment, but upon the only sure and sufficient basis—the basis of ecclesiastical intercommunion.' We have not the slightest notion what this means. Presbyterians of course can return into *communion* with the Church of the Scottish bishop, but that would not be 'intercommunion,' nor 'alliance.' What alliance can there be between the Church and schism?

their wanting the imposition of episcopal hands.' What else, then, could the Archbishop suppose to be wanting? If nothing, why did he forsake the Kirk in which he was born to enter our prelatical ministry? Questions of this kind have no end. Is the 'validity' of the Sacrament absolutely contingent on the administration of both elements?¹ Is a morsel of bread more indispensable than the commission of the priest? What of the 'validity' of Quaker-communion without any Sacrament? Surely this is the highway to infidelity.

The fallacy is the common one of an undistributed middle. Neither prelate defines his terms. The Bishop probably understands 'unchurching' in the ultramontane sense of denying salvation to all who die beyond the pale. The Archbishop thought that to deny the validity of the ministry was to deny any spiritual benefit to the hearers. But the Church and the ministry have other purposes besides individual edification. 'The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; it is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ.'² Would the Bishop of S. Andrew's affirm this of every society of which he has no doubt the members may be saved? The work of the ministry is 'the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man.'³ Did the Archbishop think all sorts of ministries equally 'valid' for this purpose? Could he think so of Scotch Presbyterianism, the most divided form of discipline in the world? Why, above all, must Presbyterian ministers receive the 'imposition of episcopal hands' before they can officiate in the English Church, when a Roman priest is admitted on simple subscription? If the episcopal hand is really unnecessary to valid ordination, the Church of England is guilty of no little tyranny—not to say schism—in her treatment of non-episcopal communities.

The question is not so much of the hand as of the gift transmitted by the hand. In short, is the ministry of God or of man? Dr. Liddon says truly that

'there are, in the last analysis, two, and only two, coherent theories of the origin and character of the Christian ministry. Of these one makes the minister the elected delegate of the congregation; in teaching and ministering he exerts an authority which he derives from his flock. The other traces ministerial authority to the

¹ Extremes meet. The other day the writer was surprised and shocked by a stranger to whom he had administered the one element refusing to take the cup! He was a teetotaler, not a Papist.

² Art. XX.

³ Eph. iv. 12, 13.

Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, who deposited it in its fulness in the College of the Apostles. . . . The Apostles, thus invested with the plenitude of ministerial power, detached from themselves, in the form of distinct grades or orders of ministry, so much as was needed at successive epochs for building and supporting the Church.'

Equally undeniable is his statement of the responsibility imposed by the trust.

'The maintenance of the barrier which is raised by the episcopate between the English Church and the Lutheran and Reformed communities on the Continent is more than intelligible if we believe that upon a true episcopal succession the validity of our chief means of communion with our Lord depends ; it is hardly, I will not say intelligible, but even defensible—especially when we consider the present pressure of infidelity upon all Reformed Christendom—if, in our hearts, we believe the episcopate to be only an archæological treasure, or, as the phrase goes, a very venerable form of Church government.'¹

The 'episcopal hand' is the outward and visible sign of apostolical succession. If this is a fiction, as another archbishop never ceased to assert,² there is certainly no need of the bishop's hand ; it has nothing to give. But then there can be no call for any other hands, nor for ordination itself. There is no grace of Order to be transmitted. The Christian minister has no different mission from the churchwarden or the parish constable. This was openly avowed by John Knox.

'Other ceremony than the public approbation of the people, and declaration of the chief minister that the person there presented is appointed to serve the Church, we cannot approve ; for albeit the Apostles used imposition of hands, yet, seeing the miracle has ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge not necessary.'³

Twenty years after the Scotch Reformer's death, the *Second Book of Discipline* introduced the ceremony, not to renew the succession then irrecoverably lost, but to assert equality with episcopacy, itself (as was said) a ceremony. All the later schisms down to the last great exodus have been to accentuate the democratic basis of the ministry. It is the entire principle of English Nonconformity, and curiously enough it is the whole gist of Dr. Hatch's answer to Dr. Liddon. The position that episcopacy is of divine origin, and consequently of divine obligation, Dr. Hatch natvely confesses

¹ Sermon, pp. 8, 9, 15, 16.

² 'Apostolical fiddlesticks' was Archbishop Whately's reverent expression.

³ *First Book of Discipline*, A.D. 1560.

to be 'not a new one,' being in fact the undisputed doctrine of the entire Church before Luther. He complains of

'two preliminary assumptions which underlie not only Canon Liddon's theory, but almost all theories of Christian organization. The one is the assumption that Jesus Christ founded, whether mediately or immediately, a visible society or group of societies; the other is the assumption that He intended that society, or group of societies, to have a single form of organization.'¹

Objecting to both these assumptions as without proof, he regards them 'as the major premisses of any argument on the subject,' and wonders they have not received more attention than the facts of early Christian history. The controversies of the future, he assures us, will be conducted on a different line. Whether episcopacy or presbytery is the more primitive is merely an antiquarian question. If the usage of apostolic times is to bind all times to come the Papacy would have the best claim. But Christian communities have still, as they always had, a free right of organization. Different forms have been developed by the force of circumstances, and 'those which survive are survivals of the fittest and thereby part of the moral government of God.'

All this is no sort of contradiction to Dr. Liddon's analysis. Dr. Hatch only endorses what the other says of all theories other than the Apostolical; of this Dr. Hatch is not the representative. In speaking of the 'survival of the fittest' we cordially thank him for the word. Episcopacy has survived and moulded the force of circumstances for fifteen centuries, not to go beyond the First General Council. The Papacy itself—which, *pace* Dr. Hatch, was not a usage of apostolic times—could not supplant it. While assuming to be sole universal Bishop, the Pope is obliged in his own person to recognize the episcopal order, which at other times seems confounded with the priesthood. Gregory XVI. being a priest when elected to the Chair of S. Peter became at once Supreme Pontiff and received the 'adoration' of the bishops as Vicar of Christ and Head of the Church. But he could not enter on his see, or be qualified to ordain, till he had been consecrated a bishop by three of his own 'subjects.'² To episcopacy, in fact, we owe the survival of Christianity itself. To repeat our own words—

'The broad fact is, that no episcopal Church has ever drifted away from its first standards of doctrine, though in many cases hurtful accretions have been superimposed (and removed); whereas a

¹ *Contemporary Review*, June 1885.

² Cardinal Wiseman's *Four Last Popes*.

glance at the continent of Europe shows that not one of the great Presbyterian societies, Lutheran, Calvinist, or Zwinglian, has been able to hold firmly to the simplest elements of Christian belief, while English Nonconformity is honeycombed through and through with Arianism and kindred forms of rationalistic opinion.¹

Nonconformity now chiefly survives as a political organization for abolishing the State-aid which its founders held to be the first duty of the Christian magistrate. Wesleyanism in its shorter course has managed in like manner to desert its first love, and is rapidly following the road to political dissent. The congregations no less than the doctrine and discipline are perpetually changing.

As for the 'preliminary assumptions' discovered by Dr. Hatch, we should think it clear enough that Christ in person founded a visible society in the college of the Apostles, whom He commanded to baptize and teach all nations. Into that college Matthias was chosen in the place of Judas to take part of a 'ministry and apostleship' ordained before the Church existed. Whatever reading we adopt of Acts ii. 47,² a visible Church was constituted by the baptism of the three thousand souls who 'continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in the Eucharist and the prayers.' If this were not a visible society founded by Christ, both mediately and immediately, there is no meaning in words.

Similar societies are read of at Antioch, Cæsarea, Ephesus, and elsewhere, all organized in visible communion as one Church under the Apostolate. That being so, it rests with Dr. Hatch to show how and when his 'free right of organization' began. Were the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost free to break away from the fellowship of the Apostles, and set up other ministries for themselves? If not, when and how did later converts acquire the freedom? seeing that no one could be a Christian without being baptized into some organization, and no one could desert his place without

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1883, p. 443.

² The Revised Version, following the older codices in reading *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ* for *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, translates 'to them' instead of the literal rendering 'to the same.' The sense is further obscured by the inaccurate marginal note, 'Gr. together.' The Greek phrase is of frequent occurrence, and implies coming together *in one place* or for *one purpose* (Matt. xxii. 34; Acts i. 15). In 1 Cor. xi. 20, where the Authorized Version renders 'into one place,' the Revised Version suppresses it altogether, giving the English only of *συνερχομένων*. The present passage, referring to the society abiding in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, might fairly have been rendered 'to the same body,' i.e. the Church, whence doubtless the various reading arose: 'to them' is at once novel and incorrect.

incurring the mortal sin of schism. Dr. Hatch affirms that the well-known promise to two or three in Matt. xviii. 20 'is the charter of all Christian communities, and there is nothing to limit the freedom of association which it implies.' This text, however, is itself but a clause in the great Church charter, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.' The Lord's presence is assured to the smallest meeting of His Body mystical, as it is to the least fragment of His sacramental Body. But both are 'in His name,' of His own institution, not by the will of man. Hence Ignatius would not allow a good conscience in any who disobeyed the bishop, 'seeing they are not stedfastly gathered together according to the commandment.'¹

The sectarian interpretation espoused by Dr. Hatch would nullify the whole charter, by empowering any two or three individuals to escape from the Church, and frame new 'organizations' equally authorized and equally powerless. There would be no power at all to bind or loose upon earth. Hymenæus, Alexander, and Philetus would be free to make a new organization and excommunicate S. Paul. The privilege can hardly attach to the first blow. Did the sin of the Corinthian schismatics consist in remaining in the Apostle's organization instead of making a new one for themselves? Was every presbyter as free to rebuke Timothy as Timothy to rebuke him? or 'perverse disputers' to withdraw from him as he from them? Did those who went out from communion with S. John only exercise their free right of association according to circumstances? If not, who is to prescribe the limits? To suppose the free right to be in abeyance for the life of the inspired Apostles, and to come into operation at their removal, would be to assume the failure of the Apostolate in the very purpose of its institution. All churches and organizations are designed to continue the work after the departure of the first founders. The Apostles were not to disciple all nations by their own personal efforts, but to organize a Church to do so till the Lord come. If S. Peter thought it needful to write two epistles that the flock might be able after his decease to have the Gospel always in remembrance, he could hardly fail to make similar provision for the pastorate which he had received of the Lord. The provision made by the Apostles for the extension of the ministry during their lifetime must of necessity continue after their removal. If the whole ministry expired with themselves, the Church must fall to pieces as a building whose foundations were taken away.

¹ Ign. *Ep. ad Magnes.* c. iv.

Dr. Hatch's history will not hold water. It is not true that 'different forms of organization have been developed by the force of circumstances as the ages have gone on.' Rightly or wrongly the Episcopate succeeded to the Apostolate, and no other organization existed throughout Christendom till the great upheaval against the Papacy in the sixteenth century. We know the persons and the circumstances under which these other organizations were then developed. They all originated in secession from an existing episcopal Church. The seceders justified themselves by accusing their bishops—not without cause—of heresy and corruption in worship. So far from claiming the free right of organization invented by Dr. Hatch, they appealed to that very usage of Apostolical times which he dismisses as a question of merely antiquarian interest. The 'considerable literature' to which he alludes is devoted to the justification or refutation of this appeal. The only parties now in a condition to benefit by Dr. Hatch's contribution to the controversy are the Quakers and the Plymouth Brethren.

The Church of England always had a special interest in this question, as the only national Church retaining the apostolical succession in fact, together with strong doctrinal sympathies with the Protestant communities that suffered the loss of it. She could not dissemble her own precious inheritance; the apostolical succession was her vindication against the charge of schism from the Catholic Church. On the other hand her divines were naturally loth to condemn any engaged in the same protest against the bondage of the Papacy. They took the line of refusing to judge another man's servant; they were not called upon to distinguish between the mote and the beam in a brother's eye. Not towards Protestants only was this charity exhibited. The Act of Parliament restoring the Communion in both kinds expressly provides that 'this restoring the ancient practice with reference to the Holy Sacrament must not be interpreted to be condemning the usage of any Church out of his Majesty's dominions.' It would not of itself exclude any foreign Church from communion with our own. With respect to the ministry the Ordinal of the same date opens with this unqualified statement:

'It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there hath been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: which Offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man by his own private authority might presume to execute any of

them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualifications as were requisite for the same. And also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereunto. And therefore, to the intent these Orders should be *continued*, and reverently used and esteemed, in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following.'

This preface, confirmed by the Thirty-sixth Article, has kept its place in every edition of the Prayer Book. The altered wording at the last review, 'or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination,' accentuates the doctrine by pointedly excluding such as had obtained benefices under the Commonwealth without episcopal Orders. So far, there can be no question of the doctrine or discipline of the English Church, whatever the opinion of particular bishops or divines. It must be confessed, however, that a different note is struck in the Twenty-third Article. Still affirming the necessity of a lawful call, it goes on to say, 'Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.' Nothing is here said of continuing the Catholic Orders, and the authority of the Church takes the place assigned in the Ordinal to episcopal ordination. It is somewhat perplexing to find this indulgence among the *Articles* of a Church that allows no one to execute the ministry without episcopal ordination. It is quite true, as Dr. Jelf explains the Article,¹ that none but bishops ever had authority given them in the Church (*Ecclesia*) to call and send ministers. But if this be all, why was the plain language of the Ordinal departed from?

There is a difference, too, between the Latin and the English versions of the Article: the former implies that the persons authorized to call are themselves in the ministry, *cooptati et adsciti*; this may well point at Luther's dream of a presbyteral succession. The English being without this condition may cover Calvin's ordinations, who, though sometime a prebendary at Poitiers, was never in Holy, or even presbyterian, Orders, and yet had authority given to him and his lay elders in the 'congregation' of Geneva. Are we to conclude, then (with John Knox), that ordination is a ceremony which every particular Church may 'change or abolish' according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, provided

¹ *Lectures on the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 289.

it has the authority of the civil magistrate? ¹ This is a popular interpretation, and one that would justify the Queen in communicating at the parish church of Craithie, now within her own dominions. But though Presbyterianism has been established by law in Scotland for two centuries, it was in flat rebellion against the Scottish Crown when the Article was made, and it has never allowed its ministry to depend on the civil sanction. Moreover this interpretation is barred by the Thirty-sixth Article, for there is no doubt that what the Puritans alleged to be 'superstitious and ungodly' was the grace asserted in the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' &c. This was the very 'miracle' denied by Knox when rejecting the 'ceremony' in 1560. Both this and the Twenty-third Article were among the forty drafted by Cranmer and published by the King's authority in 1552. Knox had to report upon them as one of the six royal chaplains, and was grievously offended with the Thirty-sixth, which was then not simply negative but affirmed positively, both of the Prayer Book and the Ordinal, that they were 'very pious and agreeable to the wholesome doctrine of the Gospel, which they do very much promote and illustrate.' In moderating the subscription in 1571 the Article still maintained the doctrine of ordination—the transmission of the gift of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of episcopal hands. This, being affirmed universally of 'Christ's Church,' cannot possibly be regarded as temporary, local, or changeable.

The most we can make of the Article is to exonerate those who believe themselves lawfully called in a foreign country from the *non licet cuicumque* with which it opens. It cannot mean that English churchmen ought to believe persons lawfully called whom the English Church does not suffer to minister; but though the expression is obscure it *may* mean, generally, that lay people ought to be satisfied with the ministers sent by the public authority of the country. The test of our Church's own judgment on the subject is to be found in her action. All Churches, episcopal or otherwise, acknowledge the obligation of communion; all allow an interchange of duly qualified ministers. Rome herself is guilty of no such sectarian arrogance as to exclude from her altars a priest whose Orders are allowed to be valid. This is the true test of our Church's doctrine. Another is seen in the solicitude to secure the succession at the consecration of Parker—a guarantee of which the importance is shown by the anxiety of the Romanists to deny it.

¹ Art. XXXIV.

It is notorious, however, that the Elizabethan divines were sadly hampered by political difficulties. The Queen was deeply committed to the insurgent Scotch Presbyterians; yet it was only her steadfast will that restrained her ministers from sacrificing episcopacy to political expediency. It was pretended that the Act of Uniformity did not absolutely exclude Presbyterian ministers; and some bishops are said to have admitted them to benefices. Others, assailed by Puritan invective, were content to defend themselves without pushing the argument to extremes. Whitgift answered Cartwright that the whole Church, being naturally the subject of all ecclesiastical power, had determined from the very earliest times to be governed by bishops, and therefore it could not be right to swerve from that government, where it could be had consistently with sound doctrine and the rights of the Christian magistrate. This was an argument *ad hominem*: Cartwright was a Nonconformist, not a Separatist; he hated schism as much as episcopacy. What he wanted was to bring the English Church to the model of the Genevan as a national Establishment, compelling everyone to belong to it. The Primate thought it answer enough to prefer the whole Church to a particular one, and the English magistrate to a foreign republic. The question of succession, he thought, might keep for better times. At the same time by granting, or seeming to grant, the Calvinist major premiss that 'all ecclesiastical power resides in the body of the Church,' he left it open to the adversary to dispute his minor and his conclusion. The 'Church' of Geneva claimed equal authority with the Primitive Church, and Geneva being a republic the magistracy was in the people. Knox urged the same view on the Scottish Estates, and Cartwright on the English Parliament. Luther's presbyteral succession was never more than a dream. The people—that is to say, the portion self-styled 'the godly'—were everywhere the real root of the Presbyterian ministry. This was so clearly discerned by the English divines that their arguments were directed as much to the *jus ecclesiasticum* of the Crown as to the divine institution of episcopacy.

Bishop Bilton was the first to insist on the higher principle. He denied that the power of the keys resided in the body of the Church.

'It was settled in the Apostles before it was delivered unto the Church; the Church received it from the Apostles, not the Apostles from the Church. . . . The authority of their first calling liveth yet in their succession. . . . The Apostles' charge to teach, baptize, and

adm
in e
thes
want
else

they
endu
prese
and

7
gobl
reall
mini
whic
is sc
edific
ing.
the o
of th
effect
thoug
itself
is no
taken
in lin
the s
option
servic
prese
lorde
him i
with

W
be les
ments

¹ F
² V
spiritu
³ C
spiritu
edente
sentium
Trid. S
⁴ B

administer the Lord's Supper, to bind and loose sins in heaven and in earth, to impose hands for the ordaining of pastors and elders—these parts of the Apostolic function are not decayed, and cannot be wanted in the Church of God. There must either be no Church, or else these must remain ; for without these no Church can continue.'

Again—

'As the things be needful in the Church, so the persons to whom they were first committed cannot be doubted. The service must endure as long as the promise—to the end of the world. Christ is present with those who succeed His Apostles in the same function and ministry for ever.'¹

This learned prelate was not to be daunted by the hobgoblin of 'unchurching' the Presbyterians ; his argument really went to *inchurch* them by denying the validity of a ministry which kept them in schism. A valid ministry is that which unites the body of Christ ; a ministry which divides it is schismatical and invalid. The Puritan test of individual edification would make unity and schism words of no meaning. The Twenty-sixth Article indicates that the validity of the commission is the thing primarily essential to the benefit of the ordinance. It has not a hint that sacraments are effectual *without* the commission and authority of Christ, though the benefit may be received without the sacrament itself when a just impediment prevents its administration.² This is not (as some imagine) a Protestant doctrine ; the rubric is taken from the Sarum Missal. Our difference from Rome is in limiting the spiritual reception to cases of necessity—when the sacrament cannot be had. The Council of Trent leaves it optional.³ In the *Mirror of Our Lady*—a rationale of Divine service written for the nuns of Sion, A.D. 1530—they that are present and hear Mass are instructed how to 'receyve our lorde spiritually at euery masse, lyke as the preste receyueth him in ye sacramento.'⁴ The minister was never dispensed with except by Quakers and Plymouth Brethren.

Why an uninterrupted continuance of the ministry should be less credible than the uninterrupted continuance of the sacraments we could never understand. So long as the unity of the

¹ *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*, pp. 106, 244.

² Visitation of the Sick rubric, where the curate is to exhort to spiritual reception.

³ 'Quosdam sacramentaliter duntaxat ut peccatores ; alios tantum spiritualiter, illos nimirum qui voto propositum illum cœlestem panem edentes, fide viva quæ per dilectionem operatur fructum ejus et utilitatem sentiunt ; tertios porro sacramentaliter simul et spiritualiter,' &c.—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. xiii. 'De Euch.' c. viii.

⁴ Blunt's *Reformation*, p. 35, n.

Church was preserved, the Apostolical succession of the clergy would be as indefeasible as the baptismal succession of the laity. There was neither motive nor means to interrupt it. In the sixteenth century both lines were broken from the same cause. The Quakers, losing faith in sacraments, discontinued their use, remaining without succession of any kind. The Anabaptists, losing faith in infant baptism, began a new succession of adult baptisms with persons *ex hypothesi* unbaptized. It was the same with the succession of the ministry. Luther being a priest thought to continue the succession without bishops; Calvin being a layman would have no succession; Knox, though in priest's Orders, hated his Church too much to believe that any good thing could come out of Rome.

Surely we are not expected to admit a ministry which the parties themselves do not assert. Presbyterian and Dissenting ministers do not claim to be priests in Holy Orders of the Catholic Church; they repudiate and denounce the character. Their commission, though pretending to authority from Christ, is not derived from His Apostles, but from the people: they acknowledge no grace in ordination. Their claim is to reduce the Church to the level of a sect; they ask us to unchurch ourselves in order not to unchurch them. We do not deny the validity of presbyterian or lay baptism; our offence is in ascribing *more* to it than they themselves allow. We do not deny the power of the Word preached by Nonconformist ministers, any more than by the friars of old, or by Messrs. Moody and Sankey in our own time. If we deny them the power of consecrating and offering the Eucharistic sacrifice, it is only what they themselves deny with greater vehemence. No Churchman wishes to question the spiritual benefit of 'the Supper' or any other religious exercise, though we claim something more for a true sacrament. The Presbyterian commission is not *in pari materia* with Catholic Orders; there is no intolerance in denying its validity for purposes which it does not believe in.

But to proceed: Hooker, who was brought up in Puritan associations, and never quite shook off the yoke of Calvin's theological ascendancy, was hard pressed in steering between the rock and the shoals. Acquiescing at first in Calvin's assumption of the Church as the seat of all power, he soon came to see with Bilton that the power of the keys originated in the Lord's commission to the Apostles.

'The ministry of things divine is a function which as God did himself institute, so neither may men undertake the same but by authority and power given in lawful manner. . . . They are ministers

of G
magi
hand
whom
in hea
my sh
sins
pardo
Script
three
Presby
conce

T

'T
Apost
sacred
were a
All oth
cessors
succee
same k
the Ap
first fou
Jews, t
the Ap
cessors,
function

Again

'It
beginni
power a

The C

'that o
follow,
probabl
decease
of peac
the rest,
which th
order in

Still

'this ord
the Apost

of God, not only by way of subordination as princes and civil magistrates whose execution of judgment and justice the supreme hand of divine providence doth uphold, but ministers of God as from whom their authority is derived, and not from men. . . . What angel in heaven could have said to man, as our Lord did unto Peter, "Feed my sheep : Preach : Baptize : Do this in remembrance of me : Whose sins ye retain they are retained : and their offences in heaven pardoned whose faults you shall on earth forgive" ? . . . From Holy Scripture it clearly appeareth that churches apostolic did know but three degrees in the power of ecclesiastical order, at the first Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons, afterwards instead of Apostles Bishops, concerning whose order we are to speak in the seventh book.¹

There the argument may be summarized in this way :—

'The first Bishops in the Church of Christ were His blessed Apostles; for the office whereunto Matthias was chosen the sacred history doth term ἐπισκοπήν, an episcopal office. Bishops they were at large (*E. P.* vii. iv. 1). S. James was a bishop by restraint (2). All others who have such authority after them are their lawful successors, whether they succeed in any particular Church, as Simon succeeded James in Jerusalem, or else be otherwise endued with the same kind of bishoply power. Hence all bishops are, saith Jerome, the Apostles' successors. In their commission to be the principal first founders of an house of God, consisting as well of Gentiles as of Jews, there are not after them any other like unto them; and yet the Apostles have now their successors upon earth, their true successors, if not in the largeness surely in the kind of that episcopal function' (iv. 4). Such were the angels in the Apocalypse (v. 2).

Again—

'It was the general received persuasion, held from the first beginning, that the Apostles themselves left bishops invested with power above other pastors' (xi. 8).

The Calvinist contention he calls

'that other conjecture which so many have thought good to follow, and which myself did sometimes judge a great deal more probable than now I do, merely that after the Apostles were deceased, churches did agree amongst themselves for preservation of peace and order, to make one presbyter in each city chief over the rest, and to translate into him that power by force and virtue of which the Apostles, while they were alive, did preserve and uphold order in the Church.'

Still, if this were granted—

'this order taken by the Church itself (for so let us suppose that the Apostles did neither by word nor deed appoint it) were notwith-

¹ *E. P.* v. lxxvii. 1 ; lxxviii. 9.

standing more warrantable than that it should give place and be abrogated, because the ministry of the Gospel and the functions thereof ought to be from heaven' (vii. xi. 9).

After defending this argument at length against the alleged parity of ministers in the New Testament, with other objections of Cartwright, Hooker surprises us by suddenly reverting to 'that other conjecture' of 'the whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power,' and hence concedes that 'there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop.' Ordinarily, he says, none but bishops may ordain; but there may be extraordinary calls, in two ways—

'One is by immediate appointment of God, ratified by manifest signs and tokens from heaven,' and another is 'when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep; where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place. And therefore we are not simply and without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination' (xiv. 11).

It is remarkable that Hooker, usually so elaborate in establishing his propositions from Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers—who has, in fact, expended a wealth of Scriptural and patristic learning on the necessity for episcopal ordination—leaves the exception here assumed without a shadow of authority or definition of any sort. He adduces no one instance in which the 'ordinary institution of God' had often (or ever) given way in this matter, nor any authority for supposing that it may. He alludes apparently to such ordinances as the shewbread, the Sabbath rest, and other observances on which the law itself admitted the exemption of necessity. But the law of the priesthood was never allowed to 'give way.' The descent from Aaron was so indispensable that on the return from the Captivity some who were not found in the register 'among those that were reckoned by genealogy' were accounted polluted and put from the priesthood.¹ Though really sons of priests the visible register was essential to the exercise of the sacred function. The Apostle argues that the Lord Himself *could* not be a priest under the law, because He was not of the priestly tribe, and that upon earth He did not assume His own priesthood without an external vocation from the Father. Ecclesiastical history is

¹ Nehemiah, vii. 64.

so
quo
tian
a Ch
epis
quer
rest
bish
or lo
K
a pr
serte
ordin
chan
they
ordin
tion,
that
obey
Knox
was n
have
surm
Luth
selve
as the
Edwa
reign
succe
Halla
mean
extirp
day th
such r
and w
Church
of the
than s
'T
Scriptu
remedy
other c
and im
conside
be driv
xi. 14).

so far from allowing any exception that Hooker himself quotes 'the general received persuasion of the ancient Christian world that *ecclesia est in episcopo*; the outward being of a Church consisteth in the having of a bishop' (vii. v. 2); also the epistle to S. Cyprian from the Church at Rome, that, in consequence of their bishop's death, nothing could be done for the restoration of the lapsed 'till God did send them a new bishop' (vi. 8). Without a bishop there was no power to bind or loose.

Hooker's concession, then, amounts to no more than a provisional indulgence for an emergency never really asserted. He supposes an unavoidable interruption of the ordinary vocation, succeeded by a return to the appointed channel. But this is exactly what the Presbyterians denied; they contended that theirs was the true and only lawful ordinary vocation; that prelacy was an unscriptural usurpation, and a bishop really no more than a presbyter. It is true that Luther, Calvin, and Beza professed their readiness to obey bishops if any could be found of their own opinions; Knox too had his *tulchan* bishops in Scotland. But there was no need to be without real bishops if they had chosen to have them. The difficulty was not so great as we have seen surmounted by the Alt-Catholics in our own day. The Lutherans certainly had one consecrated bishop among themselves, Herman of Cologne, and they might have had as many as they pleased consecrated in England during the reign of Edward VI. The Calvinists had with them, throughout the reign of Mary, the very bishops who continued our own succession at the accession of Elizabeth. It is clear, as Hallam observes, that they wanted the will more than the means. Presbyterians of all classes abhor episcopacy; they extirpated it by force of arms when they could, and to this day they thank God that they are not as the prelatists. To such men Hooker's provisional toleration must have been gall and wormwood. His apology for the Scottish and French Churches, who rested their discipline on the express command of the Lord in the New Testament, reads more like irony than serious argument.

'Though they have not that which best agreeth with the sacred Scripture, I mean the government that is by Bishops . . . which to remedy it is for the one altogether too late, and too soon for the other during their present affliction and trouble, this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering that men, oftentimes without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best' (iii. xi. 14).

Why 'too late' in Scotland? At Hooker's birth the episcopate was as firmly established there as in England. The presbyterian schism began with the riot at Perth, A.D. 1559. Knox's *Book of Discipline* retained the title and office of bishop, though deserting the Apostolical succession. The Second Book, abolishing the office itself, did not pass till 1580, and it was not till 1592, the very year of Hooker's publication, that James reluctantly accorded the royal assent. If Hooker had lived to the moderate age of fifty-seven he would have witnessed the actual restoration of the episcopate, which he despaired of at forty.

We now know how lamentably this line of argument failed either to convert or conciliate the Presbyterians. The truth is that all parties then ascribed a great deal more to the civil power than would now be allowed by any. The King was the main bulwark of Protestantism against the Pope. Luther, sustained by his Elector, was quite as Erastian as Cranmer; Calvin differed only in relying on the secular arm of the democracy; Knox and Cartwright appealed to parliaments, not to synods. The sin of State-aid did not even loom in the distance; indeed, no one ever discovered it till deprived of the benefit. Loudly as Presbyterians now talk of the 'crown rights of Jesus,' their ecclesiastical constitution is wholly bounded within the four corners of an Act of Parliament.

Andrewes, Bramhall, and Laud followed the same insular policy. The royal supremacy was their tower of defence against Papist and Puritan. Schism was viewed as a State-crime more than a sin. Bramhall's *Warning against the Scottish Discipline* is based on its 'being of all others most injurious to the civil magistrate, most oppressive to the subject, most pernicious to both.' He disclaims any wish to meddle with their 'canonized Diana,' if they would keep her at home. 'What have I to do with the regulations of foreign Churches, to burn mine own fingers with snuffing other men's candles? Let them stand or fall to their own master.' It is because they attempt to obtrude their dreams on the English and their sovereign himself that he takes up the defence. In Ireland after the Restoration, when reordaining Presbyterian ministers presented to benefices, he inserted this curious clause in their letters of orders:—

'Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit) nec validitatem aut invaliditatem eorundem determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros Ecclesiarum forinsecarum condemnantes, quos proprio iudici relinquimus, sed solummodo supplentes quicquid prius defuit per canones Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ requisitum, et providentes paci

Eccle
fiat,
presb

His
when
want
passe
being
to ra
could
ing th
but p
stolic
ing'
Baxto
pasto
the ep
to unc

'T
their
Church
to Bish
it doe
Church
Church
salvati
which

Br
essence
Church
from
Vindi
writes

'W
which
munio
symbol
(quâ ta
And in

'Se
second
where v
have w
bour C

Ecclesiæ, ut schismatis tollatur occasio et conscientiis fidelium satisfiat, nec ullo modo dubitantes de ejus ordinatione, aut actus suos presbyteriales tanquam invalidos aversantes.¹

His biographer compares this proceeding with Nehemiah's when he removed some of the priests from the priesthood for want of pedigree, not questioning their acts while they passed as priests. When asked if he meant to deny their being ministers of the Gospel, the Archbishop begged them not to raise the question, but to comply with the law, or they could have no legal title to the benefice, or power of recovering the tithes. Doubtless very sound and practical advice, but plainly showing that in England and Ireland the Apostolical succession was indispensable. The charge of 'unchurching' other Protestants is noticed in Bramhall's answer to Baxter. Allowing 'the ordinary uninterrupted succession of pastors to be of the *integrity* of a true Church,' he denies that the episcopal divines intend thereby to introduce the Pope or to unchurch other Protestants.

'They unchurch none at all, but leave them to stand or fall to their own master. They do not deny those Churches to be true Churches wherein salvation is to be had. They will readily subscribe to Bishop Andrewes' determination: if episcopacy be of Divine right it does not follow that there is no salvation without it, or that a Church cannot consist without it. He is blind who does not see Churches consisting without it; he is hard-hearted who denieth them salvation. There may be something absent in the exterior regiment which is of Divine right, and yet salvation be to be had.'

Bramhall adds that he grants them the true nature and *essence* of a Church, but not the 'integrity or perfection' of a Church. Here he goes beyond Andrewes, and differs not from Dr. Liddon only, but from himself. In his *Just Vindication of the Church of England* against schism he writes—

'Whosoever doth wilfully break the line of Apostolical succession, which is the very nerves and sinews of ecclesiastical unity and communion, both with the present Church and with the Catholick symbolical Church of all successive ages, he is a schismatick (*quâ talis*), whether he be guilty of heretical pravity or not.'

And in the *Serpent Salve* he asks—

'Seeing there is required to the *essence* of a Church, first, a pastor, secondly, a flock, thirdly, a subordination of this flock to his pastor, where we are not sure that there is right ordination, what assurance have we there is a Church? I write not this to prejudge our neighbour Churches,' &c.

¹ Bramhall's Works (1677), *Life*.

Still, in defining the Church of England he understands 'that Church which was derived by lineal succession from the British English and Scottish bishops by mixt ordination, as it was legally established in the days of King Edward VI.'

Bramhall, therefore, either halts between two opinions, or by 'essence' he means no more than would be allowed by all except Rome to Quakers, who have not so much as the name of a Church, and by Rome herself to catechumens, dying in faith without being yet admitted into any Church by baptism. Dr. Liddon means by a Church an organized member of the mystical body instituted by Christ in the persons of His Apostles. Its being consists in rightful succession to their doctrine and fellowship. This being admitted on all sides, it follows that if episcopacy be of divine right there can be no succession, and therefore no Church, without it. Nothing remains but Dr. Hatch's 'free right of association,' which all parties then abominated as schism.

What these great divines were really pleading for was *toleration*—the darling foible of the English Church. No other ever tolerated a rival; and none has so completely united all rivals in unmitigated intolerance of herself. When the question which our divines desired not to raise was forced upon them at the point of the sword by the Solemn League and Covenant, then they felt the edge of the Protestant canon that 'omission is prohibition.' What they had declined to pronounce unlawful in others was made a law against themselves. Jeremy Taylor, the champion of *Liberty of Prophesying*, stood bewildered.

'For my part I know not what to say. The question hath been so often asked with so much violence and prejudice, and we are so bound by public interest to approve all that they do, that we have disabled ourselves to justify our own. Our own episcopacy is thought not necessary because we did not condemn the ordinations of the presbytery.'

The bishops came back at the Restoration sadder and wiser men. The whole nation had drunk too deeply of Presbyterian mercies to hear any more of compromise. The Ordinal was new-worded, to ensure the exclusion of non-episcopal Orders. Episcopacy was restored in Scotland, where it had never been legally disestablished:¹ and measures were

¹ Bishops (unconsecrated) continued in Scotland from Knox's time with a brief interruption to 1610, when in a General Assembly convoked by the King at Glasgow episcopacy was restored as the national Church 'in all time coming,' and the Apostolical succession was renewed by the consecration of Archbishop Spottiswood. The General Assembly of

taken
foes
bish
was
form
and
relu
The
ation
ques
of ep
of E
It is
lish
of S
Unit
cessi
the
illusi
fight
Chris

I
conti
certa
conti
to pr
the fl
there
Apos
pate
the o
unite
the o
other
a wit
in bo
own s
the o
right
in sho

1638, w
Coven
repeal
as in E
of Arch

taken to extend it to the American colonies. Its hereditary foes, the lawyers in the House of Commons, went beyond the bishops in insisting on the episcopal surplice. Reordination was now felt to be the most unmistakable renunciation of former claims; under the double pressure of this necessity and the severest Act of Uniformity ever passed, Presbyterians reluctantly became Separatists and ultimately Dissenters. The subsequent legal establishment in Scotland and the Toleration Acts in England make no difference in the ecclesiastical question. To deny the Apostolical succession, *i.e.* the necessity of episcopal hands to valid ordination, is to confess the Church of England the most inconsistent and intolerant upon earth. It is this tenet, and only this, which justifies at once the English Ordinal and the Catholic remnant of the ancient Church of Scotland, together with their common daughter in the United States of America. Apart from the Apostolical succession there can be no sin in schism, no possible check on the 'free right of association.' We drift into the prodigious illusion of an invisible Church, wherein all sects and creeds fight and prey upon one another, and yet are all one body in Christ. This is to 'unchurch' Christianity itself.

It is certain that all the churches of the New Testament continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, certain also that all churches at the present day profess to continue in both. Their ministers, however appointed, claim to preach the Gospel and minister the sacraments, and feed the flock that Jesus Christ committed to His Apostles. All, therefore, whatever they may say, practically pretend to the Apostolical succession. The difference is that in the Episcopate the succession is historical, in others imaginative. To the one it has descended, like the sacraments themselves, by uninterrupted transmission through the intervening ages; by the others it is assumed of their own mere motion, with no other sanction than the consent of their hearers. The one is a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ; the others mere readers in books received from another, which they expound in their own sense. The one is an Order instituted by the Holy Ghost; the others assume an office to which anyone else has equal right, and which each can leave at his own discretion. The one, in short, is the commissioned ambassador for Christ; the

1638, which expelled the bishops and imposed the Solemn League and Covenant, with all the acts and ordinances of the rebel parliaments, were repealed by the 'Act Rescissory' of 1661, and the Church being restored as in England the episcopal succession was renewed by the consecration of Archbishop Sharp.

others are voluntary interveners, who, whether established by law as in Scotland, or protected by law as in England, are still only of man and by man, with nothing but their own word to attest the will of God.

ART. VIII.—DID THE STATE ENDOW THE CHURCH?

The Case for Disestablishment. (Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control. London, 1884.)

IN our last number we considered the Liberation Society's 'case' so far as it concerned establishment. We now propose to discuss the further question as to the disendowment of the Church.

Just as the Liberation Society has formulated its scheme for disestablishment on the fallacious assumption that the State established the Church, so it proposes disendowment as an essential part of its scheme on the erroneously alleged grounds that the State gave to the Church her endowments.

By the ancient property of the Church we may understand her buildings, tithes, and lands. Now surely no reasonable intelligent man who is acquainted with the mere outlines of English history would venture to assert that the State gave all this property to the Church, or that the Crown—which historically preceded what is now called the State—was the donor or grantor of this property. That the Kings of England, in their capacity as members of the Church, under a sense of religious duty built, or contributed to build and endow, cathedrals and churches in localities in which they were specially interested is true, and is what might have been expected of them; but the earls, barons, and other great men of the realm did precisely the same on their estates for the benefit of their families, servants, tenants, and dependents.

This was the primary process of endowment, as described in the statute 24 Henry VIII. cap. 12, sec. 1, in which it is declared that '*the King's most noble progenitors and the antecedents of the nobles of this realm have sufficiently endowed the said Church.*' This declaration was made against the usurped claims of Rome, just as in the Statute of Provisors in the reign of Edward III., 1352, protecting the rights of patronage

of t
the
and
Hol
of E
and
no c
end
in th
VII
sors
the
by t
in th
end
geni
the c

I
once
oppo
Stat
the c
expe
form
or, if
least
statu
prog
refer

I
an in
endow
of th
Chur
right
and
action
paym
in C
Crow
but th
we fir

1 S
ward
13, 14,

of the Crown and of the various patrons of benefices against the usurpation of the Pope in his attempts to bestow bishoprics and benefices upon his own favourites, it was declared that 'the Holy Church of England was founded . . . within this realm of England' by the King's 'progenitors and the earls, barons, and other nobles of the realm and their ancestors.' We find no claim whatever to the effect that the State or the Crown endowed the Church. And here it is to be noted that neither in the words which we have quoted from the statute of Henry VIII. nor in the words referred to from the Statute of Provisors in the reign of Edward III. is there any claim made to the effect that even the endowments were given to the Church by the Crown or the nobles or other great men of the realm in the days of either of these sovereigns. In both cases the endowments of the Church are traced back to their 'progenitors,' 'antecessors,' and 'ancestors,' each statute referring the date of endowment back to an ancient indefinite period.

But there are certain considerations which, we think, ought once for all to convince even the most prejudiced and bigoted opponents of the Church of the error of supposing that the State conferred upon the Church her endowments. Surely, if the State had endowed the Church, we might very reasonably expect to find such an important national and public act formally set forth and described in some statute of the realm; or, if not formally stated, we might reasonably expect it at least to be incidentally referred to, in like manner as in the statute of Henry VIII. and in the Statute of Provisors the progenitors of the kings and the ancestors of the nobles are referred to as those who individually endowed the Church.

Do we find in the statutes a formal declaration or even an indirect reference to the alleged assumption that the State endowed the Church? We find neither. And yet the statutes of the realm abound with records of contentions between the Church and the State,¹ making claims of their mutual vested rights and interests in benefices, temporalities of bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical dignities during vacancies, unjust exactions and extortions from the 'folk of Holy Church,' the payment of subsidies to the Crown by the bishops and clergy in Convocation, as well as frequent quarrels between the Crown and Rome on the long-disputed question of investiture; but throughout all these chronicles of contentions and conflicts we find no record, direct or indirect, to the effect that ever the

¹ See 9 Edward II. stat. 1; 25 Edward I. stat. 1, cap. 6; 9 Edward II. stat. 1, cap. 9, and stat. 2, cap. 11; 9 Edward II. stat. 1, caps. 13, 14, and 16; 14 Edward III. stat. 4, caps. 1 and 5.

Crown or the State claimed to have endowed the Church, or that ever the Church admitted that she was so endowed.

Further, had the State endowed the Church on national principles of making provision for the religious wants of the people, it surely would not only have made equitable arrangements by which the endowments would have been in the first instance more equal, but would also have seen to it that they were from time to time readjusted and redistributed according to the changing circumstances of the country. But no such origin was claimed by the State for the endowment of the Church, and no such disposing and redistributing power was ever exercised over them.

Then again, if the State, by a great national act, had endowed the Church—if it had built her churches and endowed them with tithes or lands—is it likely that it would have bestowed the patronage of them to thousands of irresponsible private persons, who in all respects treated such patronage as their own, independent of the State, subject only to the approval of the bishop?¹

Further, if the State endowed the Church, how came it to pass that there exists no evidence of anything indicating any designed national system of endowment? So far from the Church being endowed *nationally* she is not endowed nationally at all. She is endowed exclusively locally and parochially. She has no central trust administrative and executive Church body in which her property is vested. It is vested in thousands of corporations, sole and aggregate, who in temporal matters are entirely independent of each other, and whose property and endowments have no ownership in common. All this is, to say the least of it, very unlike a system of national endowment, such as we might have expected to have been drawn up and formulated by the State, had the State from its public sources provided the endowments of the Church.

Then, again, whether we consider the very sites on which ancient parish churches were erected, the great comparative differences which they exhibit as to original cost, architecture, and size, in many cases out of all accord and proportion to the population, we are compelled, apart from any other evidence, to come to the conclusion that they could not have been erected according to any formulated State plan, nor built from the public sources of any State funds, but must have been the outcome of the piety and liberality of the Church's own individual members exercising their unrestrained liberty in erecting these ancient noble buildings where and in

¹ See 25 Edward III. stat. 3, cap. 1.

what manner they chose, according to the disposition and the liberality which God had given them.

Then, further, with respect to tithes, if they were, as is alleged, the creation of the State by virtue of Acts of Parliament, how can it be explained or accounted for that the very earliest Acts of Parliament, so far from purporting to create tithes, are based upon and take for granted their prevalent existence, and that these statutes prescribe, not that they shall be paid according to any State requirements, but as the '*right and possession of His [God's] Church*' (1 Rich. II. cap. 14); '*as the law of Holy Church required*' (4 Hen. IV. cap. 11); as due unto God and Holy Church (27 Hen. VIII. cap. 20). Then, as to the *amount* and *manner* of their payment the same statutes provide, not that they shall be paid according to any State-originated system of national endowment, but '*after the laudable usages and customs of the parish or other place where the tithe-payer dwelleth*'—thus showing that the amounts of the tithe and the methods of their collection were recognized as of private, local, and not State, public, and Parliamentary origin.

So, did space permit, and were it further necessary to the proving of our points, we might go on enumerating characteristics of tithes, which would prove conclusively beyond all doubt that they were neither *created* by Acts of Parliament nor were in any way originated by State authority, but were purely the result of the Church enjoining upon her members a moral and religious obligation to contribute permanently to her support, which they, as loyal and devoted members of her fold, recognized and acted upon according to their varying means and ability.

Again, if the State regarded itself as the endower of the Church, especially with respect to tithes, how came it to pass that until the Tithe Commutation Act the payment of tithes was a matter in which the civil courts of the State did not intervene, and that the recovery of their payment was to be sought only through the Church courts, thus showing that tithes were a payment due from the cultivators of the soil to the Church, legally sanctioned by the common and written law of the land, but not to be sued for in the civil courts, and over which these courts asserted no jurisdiction?

But it is alleged that whatever doubts may exist as to the State having endowed the Church, and as to its being the real owner of Church property, with an absolute right over its disposal, Henry VIII. settled all these points as historic facts by confiscating the Church's endowments and devoting them

not only to other than religious uses, but by bestowing large portions of them upon his political and other favourites.

Our reply is that Henry VIII. by his legalized sacrilegious robbery settled none of these points. There were no claims set forth in his confiscating statutes to the effect that the State had endowed the Church, that it had absolute ownership in her property, and that it had a right, at what time and in what manner it pleased, to take away the endowments on the assumption that it had given them.

The fact is that the rapacious spoliation of Church property by Henry VIII., was based upon no such assumptions, nor in the confiscatory statutes were any such assertions directly or indirectly made. Henry VIII.'s pleas as set forth in the statutes for taking away the property from the religious houses were that these institutions, after a series of warnings, which they had received during the long course of two hundred years, remained in a state of incorrigible immorality and hopeless corruption;¹ that they had not only ceased to answer the purpose for which they were founded, but that their continued existence was subversive of the very object which lay at the root of their establishment; that their endowments therefore were diverted from their originally devoted uses, and consequently were held in alienation; and—these things being so—that their endowments should be forfeited, and applied to other religious objects whereby 'God's words might be better set forth, children brought up in learning, clerks nourished in the Universities, old servants decayed to have livings, almshouses for poor folk to be sustained in, readers of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin to have good stipend, daily alms to be ministered . . . and exhibitions for ministers of the Church.'²

Now, it does not concern our present object to inquire whether Henry's avowed pleas as here set forth were other than hypocritical pretences to get possession of the vast property of religious houses, nor to consider how far he devoted it to these professed reformed uses. It is enough for the purposes of our present discussion to ascertain that in all that he did he did not claim that the State endowed the Church, that upon that ground the State had any right to 'resume possession' of the Church's endowments, and that the State had an absolute ownership in Church property, more than in that of other endowed corporations. It is sufficient for us to show that in disposing of Church property, while he

¹ 31 Henry VIII., cap. 9.

² See *ibid.*

squandered it upon his own extravagances, and lavished it upon his favourites, he did at least maintain some appearance of justifying his religious pretences by founding five new bishoprics, professorships in the Universities, &c., and therefore the entire proceedings of this wholesale robbery by Henry VIII. afford not the shadow of a foundation for the plea and the scheme of the Liberation Society that the property of the Church is national property, that it was so treated by Henry, and that therefore it may and ought now to be taken by the State and applied to other than religious uses.

But still further, it was only with the property of the Church alleged to be held in abuse of its trust and in alienation from its originally devoted uses that Henry ventured to deal, which property—consisting chiefly of lands—can in many cases be traced, not only to its present possessors, but to its original donors. His scheme of spoliation did not extend to the endowments of bishoprics, benefices, &c.

But even suppose Henry had confiscated the property of the Church on the alleged pleas that the State gave to the Church her endowments, that it had ownership in them, and therefore that it had a right at its pleasure to take them away from her and devote them to secular uses. Should we be justified on these grounds in arguing that the mere fact of property being confiscated by the Crown or State is enough to prove the absolute ownership of either in the property so confiscated?

This undoubtedly would be an inconvenient and dangerous principle to apply to landed estates throughout the kingdom, if we bear in mind that at the Conquest all landed estates and manors and charges upon them were confiscated by William the Conqueror, their title and succession were completely broken, and such of them as were not absolutely taken away from their previous owners had to be redeemed, and were held on a completely new tenure, on conditions of certain fines paid or services rendered to the king.

But the Church's buildings, landed estates, and charges upon land in the shape of tithes were never confiscated by the Conqueror. He laid no spoliating hands upon them, but regarded them as exempted and protected from the hands of the spoliator by virtue of their being devoted to the honour of God and the maintenance of His holy Church.

It will therefore be seen that if confiscation of property by the Crown or State proves the ownership of either in the property so confiscated, all the real property in England, save and except the property of the Church, must be vested

in the Crown or State, seeing all such property was confiscated by William the Conqueror. The absurdity of such an argument and the results to which it would lead must be at once evident.

View the subject as we may from every standpoint, therefore, the Liberation Society has no such pleas to advance to justify—even in pretence—its proposed scheme of spoliation, which it contemplates extending to all ancient endowments of the Church, of whatever kind and for whatever object.

But it is affirmed by the Liberation Society in its 'case' that not only was a portion of ecclesiastical property confiscated by Henry VIII. to his own purposes at the Reformation, but that he took that which remained from the Church of England which existed before the Reformation, and gave it to the Church of England which he—as is alleged—created at the Reformation. We have already shown these assumptions to be most unfounded and erroneous. There was no old Church of England displaced and rejected at the Reformation. No new Church was founded. As Professor Freeman says, there was no particular moment called the Reformation, at which the State of England determined to take property from one Church and set of people and give it to another. Just as there was no systematic State endowment in the sixth or seventh century of the Church in this country, still less was there at the Reformation any disendowment of one religious body for the purposes of transferring its endowments to another. We have, in short, to get rid of the industriously circulated unfounded and pernicious error that the State of England did away with one Church at the Reformation, stripped her of her endowments, and conferred them upon another Church which it—as is alleged—by Act of Parliament created. There are no provisions in any of the Reformation Statutes purporting to change the identity of the Church, or to transfer the property and endowments of England's old Church to any new Church or new ecclesiastical body referred to as created at the Reformation.

The Church of England no more became a different Church at the Reformation, changing her identity because she changed certain doctrines and practices, than a man loses his identity of body and mind by the mere fact of changing his ideas, opinions, and practices. Such current popular fallacies are the product of ignorance, and it is impossible for any intelligent man in search of truth to succeed in finding such an idea supported by the testimony of any historian of generally acknowledged authority.

Then, coming down even to the period of the Commonwealth, Oliver Cromwell, who was one of the greatest of political, civil, and religious revolutionists, never in any of the enactments of his time set up the claims that the State endowed the Church, that on that ground it had disposing power over the Church's endowments and property to what secular use it pleased, and that on that ground it had a right to 'resume possession' of such endowments and property. Oliver Cromwell changed for the time being the form of religious use to which the endowments of the National Church were devoted, but in all his most extreme measures we find no claim made of State ownership in Church property, nor any proposition made by him such as the Liberation Society proposes—namely, completely to alienate the endowments of the Church to secular uses.

But it is stated that even in recent times the State has claimed an ownership in the property of the Church and a disposing power over it, which necessarily took for granted that it regards itself as the public source whence the endowments came. It is alleged that the very facts of the State appointing an Ecclesiastical Commission to hold, manage, administer, and redistribute the lands, houses, &c., which are the property of bishoprics, cathedral chapters, &c., prove that the State has assumed ownership in the property and absolute disposing power over it. We deny that there is a shadow of foundation for any of these assumptions in the reasons assigned by the State in its Parliamentary enactments for either bringing into existence the Ecclesiastical Commission or effecting the commutation of tithes.

As to the reasons assigned by Parliament for the appointment of the Ecclesiastical Commission, they are contained in the preamble of the Act, the whole purport of such reasons being that the Commissioners should be appointed to so manage and deal with the Church property specified as to make 'better provision for the cure of souls in the parishes where such assistance is most required.' Surely in these words descriptive of the object of the Ecclesiastical Commission there is no manifest or covert claim made by the State to ownership in the Church's property. Nothing in the Act affords the slightest grounds for maintaining that the State made any claim to devote the property of the Church to other than religious uses. And as for the work of the Ecclesiastical Commission, we do not say that they have not a discretionary power in given localities in which they have large landed property, when they sell or let their lands for

building purposes, to make conditional grants of certain portions of it for the benefit of the public health ; but we maintain that in every act which they have done they have kept, or, according to the specific provisions of their powers, ought to keep, steadily and undeviatingly in view the purpose for which they were appointed—to turn to the best account the property of the Church, and to redistribute its surplus to the purposes for the carrying out of which they, as a body, were brought into existence—making better provision, throughout the growing populous districts of England, for the cure of souls, in parishes specially needing their help.

And as to Parliament dealing with the property of the Church in tithes by the Tithe Commutation Act supporting any such idea as that which is embodied in the Liberation Society's scheme, why the whole thing is preposterous. The State, as the supreme trustee of all property in the kingdom, in dealing with the Church's property in tithes, through the agency of Parliament, assumed no ownership in the property of the Church any more than it assumes ownership in the property of the charities of the kingdom by its appointment of the Charity Commissioners to superintend the management of trust property.

By the passing of the Tithe Commutation Act the Church's property may or may not have been depreciated in value, but whether that was so or not is not our point of inquiry here, for that is a result to which all property is more or less subject with respect to which Parliament chooses to legislate. The point for which we contend is that by the Commutation of Tithes Acts there was no assumption on the part of the State of having endowed the Church, or of its right of ownership in the tithes of the kingdom, nor was there any intention whatsoever to alienate the existing tithes to secular uses, nor were they by any of the Acts so alienated.

The only question which remains for us to deal with in connexion with this branch of our subject is the fact of the State disestablishing and disendowing the Irish Church. Here again it is not part of the object of our discussion to show either that the State was right or wrong in so doing, or that the results have been beneficial or otherwise to the Irish Church. We have simply to deal with the facts, that, whatever were the reasons and policy which led the State to disendow the Irish Church, the reasons set up were not that the State had given to the Church her endowments, nor that it was expedient wholly to reapply them to secular uses, *both of which assumptions are of the very essence of the claims made*

by the Liberation Society on behalf of the State in urging the nation to proceed to the disestablishment and disendowment of the English Church. Much as the Irish Church may have suffered through her disendowment, there still stand out on the face of the legislative instrument of that transaction the facts that a new Church body was recognized and re-endowed with a nucleus endowment of some half-million sterling, that all the clergy received what was regarded as equitable compensation for their ascertained life interest in the Church's property, and that in every case in which a bishop or clergyman commuted his interest in favour of the re-endowment of the new Church body that body received $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. premium on his having done so. Bad as the measure may be thought by many for the disendowment of the Irish Church, therefore, it affords no grounds nor precedent whatsoever for the scheme urged upon the public by the Liberation Society, the very essence of which is confiscation of all Church property up to a given date and its reapplication to other than religious uses.

But even suppose the State did, seven or eight hundred years ago, endow the Church, and that during all the intervening period the Church had retained undisturbed and peaceful possession of those endowments, and that her title to them has been reaffirmed by a large number of Acts of Parliament and by successive decisions in various courts of justice extending over centuries : is it to be accepted by the public that by a capricious, arbitrary, revolutionary act of the State, to which it might be incited by the Liberation Society, its adherents, and their supporters, the State of the present day is justified in taking away from the Church the endowments alleged to have been given to her by the State which existed some hundreds of years ago ? If this is to be the manner in which all property is to be dealt with that is alleged to have been granted by the State either to corporate bodies or to individuals, there is indeed a strange and unprecedented revolution of the laws of property about to be inaugurated in England, which will be little short of a general confiscation of landed properties throughout the country—landed properties which were not only undoubtedly the grants of the State to corporations and to political and other favourites of the Crown, but the gifts of which were bad, tainted, and dishonest, and the history of whose whole acquirement is a history of inflicted wrong upon some and a conferring of undeserved favours upon others. If the State of the present day is, in the euphonious phrase of the Liberation Society, to 'resume

possession' of what the State of the past once granted, even to private families in the country, what is to become of some of the great houses in the land, whose names we need not mention here, but some members of which are unfortunately, with a rashness and with a forgetfulness of the origin of their own property, distinguishing themselves by joining in the popular cry for the application of a principle of disendowment to the Church which they may soon unexpectedly find applied to their own possessions?

If, then, the Liberation Society alleges as its primary grounds for proceeding with its scheme of disestablishment and disendowment that the State both established and endowed the Church, and if it not only fails to show that these assumptions have any foundation in facts forthcoming from historical evidence, but if, on the other hand, we have succeeded in making it clear to our readers that there were no periods in English history in which the State said of a religious body called the Church, 'I will organize and establish this institution by law, and I will endow it with sufficient property in lands and tithes for its maintenance;' and if, as we have pointed out, there be no evidence forthcoming from the statutes of the realm recording the transactions between the Church and the State (transactions, amongst other things, dealing with all manner of intricate questions as to the mutual vested interests of Church and State in Church property) that ever the State laid claim to having endowed the Church, or that ever the Church admitted any such claim on the part of the State; and if, as we have shown, neither the spoliation of Church property which took place at the Reformation, nor its changed applied uses during the Commonwealth, nor any legislation which has subsequently taken place as to Church property, has ever been based upon the alleged facts that the State endowed the Church, and that the State therefore has absolute disposing power over her property—then we think we have conclusively shown that the primary grounds on which the Liberation Society bases its 'case' for disestablishment and disendowment have absolutely failed.

It follows, therefore, that all such statements that the property of the Church is 'national property,' or is 'public property,' or is 'public property appropriated by the State to the use or to the maintenance of the Church of England,' are statements which, in the sense in which Liberationists make them, have no foundation in the history of the transactions of the Church and realm—are mere modern inventions designed to serve a controversial purpose by taking for granted as facts

the alleged fallacious assumptions which lie at the base of the whole disestablishment and disendowment controversy, which we have inquired into, and which always ought to be made subjects of inquiry—namely, Did the State establish and endow the Church?

It may be asked, then, Do you deny that the State has the right to deal with the property of the Church? Our reply is, Not at all. We deny no such thing. The State, we maintain, has a *right*, when justifiable occasions arise, to deal with all property, and certainly it has at all times the *power*. But the State has just as much right—no less and no more—to deal with the property of the Church as it has to deal with all private, voluntary, and religious corporate property, including the property of all the Dissenting chapels in the land.

We know of no common or statute law by which the State debars its power to deal with all property, or limits its title-giving, tenure-defining, safeguarding, and tax-and-rate-imposing, and therefore value-altering and value-modifying power over all property, and power of even confiscating property from one object or use and reapplying it to another when it thinks well; but what we maintain is that there is nothing in the origin, nature, title, and tenure of Church property, nor in the uses to which it is devoted, which gives the State right or power to deal with it more than with other property.

It is, then, we maintain, for Liberationists—failing to show that the State established and endowed the Church—to give up their scheme for her disestablishment and disendowment so far as they base such proposals on these assumptions which they have failed to make good; and if they will still adhere to their scheme for disestablishment and disendowment, they must advocate it upon some other chosen grounds, on which we doubt not the advocates of the Church will be prompt and ready to meet them; and they must allege reasons in support of the State laying hands upon the property of the Church for the purpose of devoting it to alien uses, of such a nature as, if alleged and made good against any other kind of at least corporate property, would justify the State in so dealing with it.

In the meantime we have but little hope of a society and its supporters being converted to a belief in the truth of historic facts about the Church who can be content to have their cause completely represented by a book the contents of which in every one of its sections abound with historic misrepresentation, half-truths misleadingly stated, groundless assumptions and fallacious arguments based upon them.

After reading *The Case for Disestablishment* over and over again our deliberate conclusion is, that of all the good services which the Liberation Society undesignedly and unwillingly has rendered to the Church the publication of its formal *Case* is not the least. The book shows us the utmost available sources of facts and arguments which the Liberation Society relies upon to convince the people of England in favour of Disestablishment and Disendowment. It presents us with statements which Liberationists cannot at their convenience repudiate, and it enables churchmen to estimate the weight and importance of the *Case* which they have to meet before the tribunal of the electors of England.¹ The ignorant and credulous may be misled by some of its statements, but persons who are intelligent and informed will be able at once to see through their misrepresentations, sophisms, and fallacies.

ART. IX.—THE NEW PLURALITIES ACT.

1. *An Act to abridge the Holding of Benefices in Plurality, and to make better Provision for the Residence of the Clergy.* (1 & 2 Vict. c. 106. 1838.)
2. *An Act to amend the Law relating to the Holding of Benefices in Plurality.* (13 & 14 Vict. c. 98. 1850.)
3. *An Act to amend the Law relating to Pluralities.* (48 & 49 Vict. c. 54. 1885.)
4. *Chronicle of Convocation.* (1882, 1883.)

WHEN the Public Worship Regulation Act was passed in 1874, the Archbishop of Canterbury was constrained to acknowledge the need for a more stringent Act than existed for enforcing discipline amongst the clergy. There were a few isolated cases where excess of zeal or devotion to a theory led clergymen to hasty and unwise developments of ritual; there were more where apathy or indifference caused parishes to be grievously neglected. If only the spiritual benefit of the Church had to be considered, there was no doubt which of the two was the more crying evil, and demanded the more prompt attention. But the spiritual benefit of the Church is never a popular cause, whilst indignation meetings against the doings of over-zealous clergymen, if

¹ We may mention that *The Case for Establishment Stated* has just been published by the S. P. C. K.

they err in a High Church direction, are certain to secure the favour of Exeter Hall and of that large class of persons whom enthusiasm in an unwonted direction offends. The result, therefore, was what might have been anticipated. An ill-advised Bill to repress the developments of enthusiasm was introduced into the House of Lords; was exchanged for another at the instance of Lord Shaftesbury; was piloted through the House of Commons by Sir William Harcourt assisted by Mr. Disraeli, on whose head and that of his Government severe retribution was inflicted. Few measures have more completely justified the forebodings of its opponents than the Public Worship Regulation Act. Opposed by both Convocations, essentially a party measure, entirely out of harmony with the spirit of the age, which lacks the faith requisite to persecute with success, it has only injured the cause it was intended to uphold, whilst it has brought confusion and much individual distress into a few well-worked parishes, and what we trust is its last expiring effort at Liverpool has had the effect of converting no inconsiderable portion of that Orange city into defenders, if not partisans, of the excellent vicar of S. Margaret's, who is being prosecuted under its provisions for 'ritualistic practices.'

The promise to introduce a Bill to enable the bishops to compel the comparatively few drones in the hive of the Church to perform their obligations in a more satisfactory manner, having served its turn, seems to have passed into oblivion, and when the subject was brought forward after a considerable interval of time, it was not by those who had promised such a measure. In saying this we have no wish to throw a doubt upon the sincerity of the promise which had been given. The torrent of vituperation which was heaped upon the authors of the Public Worship Act, its miserable failures, the excitement which followed upon the imprisonment of its victims, making it doubtful whether its failures were not less damaging than its successes, were enough to deter its more prominent supporters from again seeking laurels in the field of ecclesiastical legislation. Consequently nothing was done until the present Bishop of London took up the subject three or four years since.

Before recounting what he has accomplished, it may be well to place before our readers what has been the state of the law. In 1838 an Act was passed apparently with the object of putting the Church completely in order. It was modestly described as 'An Act to abridge the Holding of Benefices in Plurality, and to make better Provision for the

Residence of the Clergy,' and there can be no doubt that it has proved most useful, putting an end to scandals which had grown up under a different state of things, and securing an amount of attention to the spiritual wants of the people which the bishops had previously been unable to enforce, however anxious they might have been to do so. In dealing with these it has been successful; in attempting to go further and regulate matters concerning which public opinion was then less formed, it has not been so fortunate.

This Act, then, containing 133 clauses, is a starting-point from which to consider the state of the law with regard to negligent, as distinguished from criminous, clerks. Its objects may be summarized thus:—

1. It prohibits holding benefices in plurality except in certain very carefully defined cases, and makes provision for uniting benefices under certain conditions; some of the unions being between sinecure rectories or vicarages and adjoining parishes inadequately endowed. It also provides for partly disuniting benefices where such a course may be desirable from increase of population or any other cause, and for annexing isolated places at a distance from their parish church to another parish.

2. It prohibits under heavy penalties any spiritual person holding preferment from renting more than eighty acres to farm, or from 'engaging in or carrying on any trade or dealing for gain or profit, or dealing in any goods, wares, or merchandise,' unless there shall be more than six partners, or it shall have devolved upon him 'by devise, bequest, inheritance, intestacy, settlement, marriage, bankruptcy, or insolvency;' but in none of these cases is the clergyman to act as a director or managing partner, or to carry on the trade in person. This prohibition is not to forbid clergymen from keeping schools, or being managers of any benefit or life or fire assurance company, or from such trafficking as is necessary in the event of their occupying a farm. Heavy fines are inflicted for disobedience.

3. It prohibits non-residence, and inflicts a heavy fine for disobedience. But in 1838 the number of benefices with habitable parsonages was comparatively small; it therefore authorizes the bishop to give license for non-residence, provided that no residence thus allowed shall be more than three miles from the church or chapel of the benefice, or, in the case of any city, town, or borough market, more than two miles. Besides this, as it is certain that causes for non-residence must arise, such as 'incapacity of mind or body,' it makes provision

for a license in such cases ; ' and also for a period not exceeding six months to any spiritual person on account of the dangerous illness of his wife or child making part of his family and residing with him as such,' no such license to be renewed without the allowance of the archbishop of the province. And all licenses of non-residence are required to be renewed at the close of the year after that in which they are given. Provision for enforcing this by fine or even sequestration is made.

By a variety of Acts since passed some of the minor regulations with regard to these matters have been varied, but substantially they remain the same now as when the Act first became law ; and except in those cases where the bishop, from easy good nature, or desire to avoid trouble, or some other worthy or unworthy cause, has granted licenses of non-residence, they have sufficed to secure the objects which the framers of the Act had in view. With none of these matters has the Act recently passed any connexion, and we now come to those with which it has dealt.

1. The stipends to be paid to the curates of non-resident incumbents, and inferentially the stipends of curates in charge of a benefice during a vacancy, are fixed by the Act according to the rates current in 1838, the smallest sum being 80*l.* a year, the largest 150*l.*, except where the income of the benefice is large and the population great, and then an additional sum not to exceed 50*l.* may be given.

2. The Act sets forth the duties which the incumbents may be compelled by law to perform. Some of these can be easily defined. Thus the 80th clause enacts that the bishop may order two full services to be performed every Sunday, and that a sermon or lecture shall be delivered at each of these services, whatever may be the value or population of the benefice ; and also in every church or chapel included in the benefice if the income from that parish or chapelry shall exceed 150*l.* and the population 400. Other portions of a clergyman's duties less easily admit of definition. With these the 77th clause attempts to grapple thus :—

' Whenever the bishop shall see reason to believe that the ecclesiastical duties of any benefice are inadequately performed, it shall be lawful for him to issue a commission to four beneficed clergymen of his diocese . . . one whereof shall be the rural dean, if any, of the rural deanery or district wherein such benefice is situated, directing them to inquire into the facts of the case ; and it shall be lawful for the incumbent of the said benefice to add to such commissioners one other incumbent of a benefice within the same diocese ; and if the

said commissioners or the major part of them report in writing under their hands to the said bishop, that in their opinion the duties of such benefice are inadequately performed, it shall be lawful for such bishop, if he shall see fit, by writing under his hand, to require the spiritual person holding such benefice, though he may actually reside or be engaged in performing the duties thereof, to nominate to him a fit person or persons, with sufficient stipend or stipends, to be licensed by him to perform or to assist in performing such duties, specifying therein the grounds of such requisition; and if such spiritual person shall neglect or omit to make such nomination for the space of three months after such requisition so made as aforesaid, it shall be lawful for the bishop to appoint and license a curate or curates, as the case shall appear to him to require, with such stipend or stipends allowed to curates by this Act in the case of non-resident incumbents, nor, except in the case of negligence, exceeding one half of the net annual value of such benefice; and such bishop shall cause a copy of every such requisition, and the evidence to found the same, to be forthwith filed in the registry of his court.'

Provision is then made to secure an appeal to the archbishop of the province within one month after the service of such requisition, and he can confirm or overrule the bishop's decision as he may think advisable.

3. Power is given to the Bishops of S. Asaph, Bangor, Llandaff, and S. David's, to 'refuse institution or license to any spiritual person who, after due examination and inquiry, shall be found unable to preach, administer the Sacraments, perform other pastoral duties, and converse, in the Welsh language'; an appeal to the archbishop within a month being allowed.

How far have these provisions succeeded in effecting what they were designed to accomplish? Where the object was something clear and definite, they have enabled the bishop, wherever he had the will and the resolution, to remedy the evils against which the Act was directed. Where the object could not be so accurately defined, the result has been disappointing. The Bishop of Exeter thus described the effect of this part of the Act:¹ 'At present all that was required was to do what was prescribed in the Rubrics, and the visiting of the sick when sent for. The Canon also required that he should seek candidates for confirmation, and prepare them for the bishop; but there he thought the whole matter stopped, and the incumbent might neglect his parish as much as he pleased, provided that he did these things.' And, what made matters worse in the case of the sick, the incumbent could not be punished unless he had omitted to come when formally

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1882, pp. 126-127.

sent for; and, to show that some clergymen were not likely to be thus troubled, he 'cited the instance of a clergyman whom he knew who had a passion for cock-fighting, and who went all over the country to attend cock-fights. He made inquiries, but could not bring him within the case of "inadequate performance of duty" as prescribed by the Act. The parish was in a sad state. It could not be said that he did not visit the sick when sent for; but the fact was that people, knowing he was never at home, did not send for him when they were sick.' Whilst the Bishop of Chichester¹ 'put the case of a man living fifty or sixty miles from London, who spent his time in looking after his own interests on the Stock Exchange, and neglected his parish most scandalously. Nothing could be done with him, because he went into his parish on Sundays and performed his duties.' In the Lower House of Convocation instances of gross neglect were mentioned, and it was known that in the then state of the law the bishops felt they were powerless to interfere.² In the following year the Bishop of Exeter (now of London), to whom the Church is deeply indebted for his action in this matter, again brought the subject before Convocation, when he thus described the strong grounds there were for seeking the power which could only be obtained by an Act of Parliament in this matter:—

'The point which I originally brought before Convocation was precisely of that character—namely, here was a man who was charged with not efficiently doing his duty which, as holder of the benefice, he was paid to do; and the remedy was to compel him to appoint some one else to do the duty which he was neglecting. The decision of the question whether or not he was neglecting his duty was given in the first instance to a commission, four members of which were to be appointed by the bishop, and the fifth by the clergyman himself. The commission reported to the bishop, and the bishop could act upon their report, but there was an appeal from the action of the bishop to the archbishop. The objections to this mode of working were: in the first place, the commissioners did not clearly understand what it was they were to inquire into. The words "inadequate performance of duty" were so exceedingly vague, that it was hardly possible for the commissioners to come to a satisfactory conclusion, or for one set of commissioners to be uniform in their decisions with another set of commissioners. Then, in the next place, complaint was made that the matter was too much in the hands of the bishop, and that the bishop had power to pack the commission in such a way as to get any decision he liked. And lastly—which was perhaps the most fatal blot in the whole—it was said, supposing there was a com-

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1882, p. 127

² *Ibid.* p. 101.

plaint that the performance of duty was inadequate, and the bishop proceeded to call on the incumbent to appoint a curate, the stipend which he could require him to give to the curate was in a large number of cases altogether inadequate to obtain the services of any curate at all. This last objection really amounted to this—that this part of the old Act was practically useless. You cannot work it at all. It was not really the fault with the old Acts. When the original Acts were drawn, the stipends were fixed in reference to the ordinary payment of curates in those days, and at the time there can be no doubt that the stipends were quite sufficient for the purposes of making the Acts operative.¹

On all sides it was admitted that the number of scandalous cases was rare, but no one denied that they existed. The more earnestly the Church is doing her work as a whole, the darker and more conspicuous become the places where those charged with her authority are unfaithful to their commission. The self-denial, self-sacrificing devotion, and love for their Divine Master and the people whom He has entrusted to their care, exhibited by some parish priests, render the more religious parishioners of men of a different stamp more dissatisfied with the neglect and apathy which they witness, and compel those who love their Church to entreat that the hirelings with whom the Church is afflicted may be obliged by law to provide others to perform the tasks for which they are paid, but which they neglect. And, still further, there are threatenings of political danger which force the whole body of the faithful to feel more really than they have hitherto done the ties by which all are bound together. The neglected members may revenge themselves upon the body, and, by helping others to plunder the endowments which have enabled the Church to fulfil her mission, may inflict a wound upon her organization which may be most injurious. It is not to be expected that constituencies largely made up of working men, who are liable to dismissal at very short notice for neglect of the tasks which they are hired to perform, will patiently see clergymen enjoying, without let or hindrance, the income of their benefices, whilst their negligent and inefficient manner of discharging the duties of their office form the stock subject of conversation in their parishes. Moreover, there are signs that the zeal and energy which, in the earlier days of the Church revival, were at least as bountifully exhibited in rural as in urban parishes, are being much more concentrated on the thickly peopled centres of industry, whilst the standard of efficiency is not rising in parishes of smaller populations; and

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, pp. 163, 164.

bishop
stipend
number
urate at
t of the
It was
cts were
payment
bub that
the Acts

ndalous
l. The
ole, the
re those
mission.
or their
to their
ore reli-
satisfied
compel
irelings
y law to
re paid,
threat-
y of the
lone the
members
g others
Church
rganiza-
pected
who are
he tasks
ergymen
eir bene-
of dis-
bject of
gns that
e Church
ral as in
on the
ndard of
ons; and

though town clergy have been at least as neglectful of their duties as those dwelling in the country, there is a power of recovery and preservation in towns where there are many churches which is not possessed by rural parishes with their single church, and where the existence of light and life or its absence at the parish church is much more directly felt for good or for evil than it is in a large town.

The present Bishop of London, knowing the evils then existing in his diocese of Exeter, and foreseeing how much mischief they must inflict upon the Church at large, unless prompt and efficient measures were taken to remedy them, very wisely brought the matter before the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury in 1881, when he¹ 'particularly pointed out the difficulty of working the Pluralities Act, especially that portion which referred to the inadequate performance of duty by incumbents.' In the course of the discussion many other points were mentioned by other bishops as requiring immediate attention—some things that were unworkable, and some that were obviously omissions, in the old Acts. Particularly, for instance, the bishops of the four Welsh dioceses pointed out the omission to provide that there should be any means of enforcing Welsh services in Wales, although there was the power of insisting that the clergy should be able to give those services. 'The result of this discussion was the appointment of a joint committee of both Houses to consider the Pluralities Acts with a view to their amendment.'

Of this committee the then Bishop of Exeter was chairman. It met several times, and after much discussion agreed to its Report, which was presented by the chairman to the Upper House on February 15, 1882, and at once sent down to the Lower House with a request that it might be considered as soon as possible. As our readers are no doubt aware, to the Reports of Convocation there are appended a series of resolutions which alone are considered by the House, and which contain all for which the House holds itself responsible; the Report is supposed to contain the grounds on which the committee recommends the resolutions it drafts, and these carry such weight as the majority of the committee is able to give to them. These resolutions were adopted by the Lower House with some very unimportant alterations, and with the omission of the tenth, and in their form thus modified were as follows :—

¹ 1. That the Report be now considered.

² 2. That "ecclesiastical duties" be defined to include not only

¹ Bishop of Exeter's speech, *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1883, p. 162.

the regular performance of divine service on Sundays and holidays, but all such duties as are enjoined by law, or the performance of which is solemnly promised by every clergyman of the Church of England at the time of his admission to holy orders in that Church.

‘3. That the commissioners to inquire into any charge of inadequate performance of duty be the archdeacon or the rural dean, at the discretion of the bishop, a canon residentiary of the cathedral elected by the dean and chapter, two beneficed clergymen of the archdeaconry, elected for not more than three years by the beneficed clergy of the archdeaconry at the archdeacon’s visitation, to whom the incumbent concerned should be allowed to add a fifth, being also a beneficed clergyman of the diocese.

‘4. That if the appointment of a curate in a case of inadequate performance of duty devolve upon the bishop, the bishop shall have power, under 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106, to increase the stipend payable to the curate by not more than 70*l.*, or to assign him the whole income of the benefice, whichever shall be the lesser sum.

‘5. That the bishop and the commissioners should have power to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses to give evidence and produce documents.

‘6. That during the vacancy of any benefice the bishop shall have power to assign to any curate or curates appointed either the whole income of the benefice, or a stipend or stipends at the rate of 200*l.* a year each, whichever shall be the lesser sum.

‘7. That wherever the duty of providing for a parish where the incumbent is non-resident devolves upon the bishop, he shall have power to increase the stipend payable to the curate under the Act of 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106 by not more than 70*l.*, provided this does not make the stipend more than the whole net income of the benefice, in which case the bishop should have power to assign the whole said net income, besides also assigning the parsonage house and premises, if any, rent free ; and further, that in parishes where the population exceeds 2,000, or where there are two churches, or a church and licensed room, not less than a mile apart, the bishop shall have power to appoint an additional curate or curates at the same stipends, provided that the total stipends so assigned do not exceed two-thirds of the net income of the benefice.

‘8. That further, in all such cases, the incumbent shall not be at liberty, without permission from the bishop, to return into residence until the time specified in his license shall have expired, nor during that time to interfere in any way with the discharge of the parochial duties as intrusted to the curate by the bishop.

‘9. That the limitation which restrains the bishop from requiring a curate to be appointed to serve the second church in a benefice which has two churches, if the two churches are less than two miles apart, be abolished.

‘11. That the bishop shall have authority to define what ministrations in Welsh shall be required of incumbents of parishes in Wales, and in parishes in England where there is a population of

not less than 500 Welsh-speaking people, and that it shall be an inadequate performance of duty to neglect to provide for them.'

We have omitted the tenth resolution because the consideration of it was postponed by the Lower House of Convocation on the day when the other resolutions were passed, and on the following day it was rejected. It stood as follows :—

'10. That in corporate cities and boroughs the union of benefices be allowed where the united population exceeds 1,500; that in all other cases the limit remain 1,500 as at present, provided that in all cases arrangements be made, if the bishop see fit, to secure two clergymen for the united benefice, and to empower the bishop to require such services as he thinks necessary in each church.'

These resolutions were carried to the Upper House, and on the next day considered by their lordships at great length. Besides a few verbal alterations there were the following changes. In clause

2. The words following 'enjoined by law' were struck out, and there were substituted for them 'but also all such other duties as were solemnly undertaken by every clergyman of the Church of England at the time of his admission to Holy Orders in that Church, and may reasonably be required from everyone who has the cure of souls.'

3. For 'two beneficed clergymen' to substitute 'one beneficed clergyman'; and after 'archdeaconry' to add 'and one layman being a justice of the peace resident within the limits of the same.'

6. For 'at the rate of 200*l.*' to substitute 'at a rate not exceeding 200*l.*'

7. To omit the words 'or a church or licensed room.'

These amendments were all accepted without debate except that on clause 3. The proposal sent down by the Upper House had been discussed in the Lower House when the resolutions were before it, and had been negatived without a division. But now it came before the members with the weight which necessarily attaches to any decision of the House of Bishops, and there were many members of the Lower House who felt so keenly the need for more stringent laws to enforce discipline amongst the clergy, in consequence of a few cases of scandal in their immediate neighbourhoods, that they were prepared to accept whatever was proposed that did not violate a principle which they deemed it essential to contend for. Consequently, by a vote of 42 to 18, this amendment was agreed to; and both Houses of Convocation had

assented to a measure whose object was to clear up the obscurities and difficulties which prevented the Act of Parliament that practically governed a large part of the compulsory discipline of the clergy, so far as the performance of the duties of their office is concerned, from effecting the good it was designed to accomplish.

To make their work effectual it was necessary to obtain the sanction of Parliament to the resolutions which had been accepted, as without such sanction they certainly could have no compulsory force, and in cases of discipline that is the only authority to which negligent or peccant clerks will yield obedience. A Bill was at once drafted and introduced into the House of Lords by Bishop Temple. Speaking of this Bill in his place in Convocation, he said :—

‘I am much obliged to the Bishops of Winchester and Peterborough for the observations which have fallen from them, and I can only object to one phrase used by each of them—namely, when in speaking of the Bill they refer to it as my Bill. I beg leave to observe that it is not my Bill, but the Bill of the committee. All the provisions were settled by the committee, and I have not in one single particular departed from the lines laid down.’¹

The Bill so introduced into the House of Lords was debated on the second reading, and again in committee, and amended in various particulars. It then went down to the House of Commons, but too late for it to have a chance of passing into law or being discussed, as there was much business before the House and it was blocked by more than one member. In the following year (1883) its history was very similar: it passed through all its stages in the House of Lords, but failed to gain the consent of the Lower House. Again in 1884 it was unable to secure the sanction of Parliament, but this time it was introduced into the House of Commons, and did not come before the House of Lords. In 1885 the Bill was again introduced into the Lower House by the same youthful member who had taken charge of it in the previous year (Mr. C. Acland, M.P. for East Cornwall), whose name and strong Liberal opinions it was hoped might avert from it the fate to which it had previously been doomed. Mr. Acland accomplished his task with great judgment and tact, which makes it the more to be regretted that he wrote a foolish letter to the *Nonconformist* in answer to an attack which had been made upon him, which seemed to show that he was more afraid of Dissenting constituents than eager to defend the

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1883, p. 168.

Church of which he was a member and to rid it of what he felt to be evils. The only serious difficulty which the Bill had to encounter was on its second reading, and that was overcome by referring it to a select committee. This committee made very few changes in it, and these not of vital moment, and so the Bill slipped quietly through the remainder of its stages in both Houses of Parliament, and, having received the royal assent, is now the law of the land.

The Act is very short, and is easily compared with the proposals of Convocation. It may be well to give the *ipsisima verba* of the most important clause, viz. that giving the interpretation of duties that may be required; and this includes the second and eleventh resolutions of Convocation. This clause in the Act (the second) runs thus:—

‘This Act shall be construed as one with the Act passed in 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106 (hereinafter referred to as the first-mentioned Act), and the Act passed in 13 and 14 Vict. c. 98, as respectively amended by this Act.

‘The term “ecclesiastical duties” in the first-mentioned Act and this Act shall include not only the regular and due performance of divine service on Sundays and holidays, but also all such duties as any clergyman holding a benefice is bound by law to perform, or the performance of which is solemnly promised by any clergyman of the Church of England at the time of his ordination, and the performance of which shall have been required of him in writing by the bishop, and in the case of benefices within the dioceses of S. Asaph, Bangor, Llandaff, and S. David’s, and the county of Monmouth, shall also include such ministrations in the Welsh language as the bishop of the diocese shall direct to be performed by the clergymen holding such benefices respectively, but so that such bishop shall not in any case require more than one service in the Welsh language on every Sunday in such church or chapel of ease situated in any such benefice: provided always, that due provision be made for the English-speaking portion of the population.’

The third clause directing how the commission of inquiry is to be framed differs from the resolution of Convocation in these points: a prebendary or honorary canon is made equally eligible for election as a commissioner with a canon residentiary; the nomination of the justice of the peace to serve on the commission is to be ‘on the requisition of the bishop by the person who presided as chairman of the quarter sessions for the county or the division of the county last preceding such requisition, or if there be no such person then by the lord-lieutenant of the county.’

The bishop or any two or more of the commissioners are authorized ‘to require the attendance of such witnesses, and

the production of such documents, evidences, and writings, as may be necessary on either side; and such bishop and commissioners respectively shall have the same powers for these purposes as now belong to the Consistorial Court and to the Court of Arches respectively.' 'Every witness is to be examined on oath, or upon affirmation when it can be legally claimed, and to be liable to be punished for perjury for giving false evidence.'

The bishop's powers to require, appoint, and fix stipends for curates in all cases are as laid down in the resolutions of Convocation.

The limits for restraining clergymen from holding benefices in plurality are restricted in respect of value and distance of churches. And now

'any clergyman may, with a license or dispensation from the Bishop, hold together two benefices, the churches of which are within four miles of one another by the nearest road, and the annual value of one of which does not exceed 200*l.*, or if on one of the said benefices there be no church, then the distance between the two benefices for the purposes of this Act shall be computed in such manner as shall be directed by the bishop of the diocese; but, except as aforesaid, it shall not be lawful for any clergyman to take and hold together any two benefices.'

For this clause Convocation has no responsibility; it rejected the clause which proposed to enlarge the limits of distance and population under which benefices might be held in plurality, and it seems to us an unfortunate reactionary proceeding in times like these for the bishops to promote schemes for adding to the number of pluralities. Pressure will be placed upon the bishops to grant dispensations for cases very different from those contemplated by the framers of the clause; and if this pressure comes from influential quarters it is notoriously difficult to resist. If proof were needed of this, it would be found in the licenses of non-residence given to City incumbents and to some others having cures in what themselves or members of their families regard as undesirable neighbourhoods. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the number of assistant curates is so large that it is difficult to furnish all the deserving with benefices. This new regulation will add to the number of assistant curates—except in cases where the incumbent, contrary to the provisions of these Acts, does not provide more than one service for each church on Sunday—and diminish equally the number of independent charges.

The first consideration on reading over the Act is, what

diff
and
dut
ex
the
neg
At
tha
and
pos
ther
stim
are
Chu
is th
und
you
ciem
for
som
to th
ther
perf
visit
and
the p
any
perf
bish
thes
miser
doctr
comm
acco
peopl
and o
to bar
to Go
exhor
need
to fra
to the
much
of Ch
vo

difference will it make in the position of the parochial clergy and of the bishop? We have seen that charges for neglect of duty are now never made, because the words of the Act are so exceedingly vague that there would be small chance of making them effectively. And that there are a few gross cases of neglect is, we fear, undeniable. How will these be affected? At the outset it makes one stringent alteration: it demands that equal care shall be given to divine service on Sundays and holidays. It is notorious that this is now not done, and possibly those who have been most eager in accusing some of their brethren of being law-breakers will most keenly feel the sting of having that epithet applied to them if their churches are not opened for public worship on the festivals of the Church. But this is only by the way. The important point is that the law now says to every clergyman, 'You shall be under legal compulsion to fulfil the promises you made when you were ordained priest.' Do those promises contain a sufficiently definite standard by which to try apathetic clergymen for neglect of duty? The House of Lords seems to have had some doubt on this head, as it expunged words very similar to those which have now become law, and inserted, instead of them, 'Ecclesiastical duties shall include the regular and due performance of divine service on Sundays and holidays, the visiting and private monishing and exhortation of the sick and the whole, the religious instruction of the young, and the preparation of them for confirmation, and all such duties as any spiritual person holding a benefice is bound by law to perform, or which may be lawfully required of him by the bishop of the diocese, and shall have been so required.' Now, these same requirements have to be gathered from these promises made by all priests.

'Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of God, so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same? Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word, and to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole within your cures, as need shall require and occasion shall be given? Will you be diligent to frame and fashion your own selves, and your families, according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make both yourselves and them, as much as in you lieth, wholesome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ?'

VOL. XXI.—NO. XLI.

M

It seems to us that here will be a standard by which negligence or the imperfect discharge of duty may be tested ; and it possesses two advantages over the words suggested by the House of Lords in a previous year. It makes it more difficult for clergymen to justify themselves for preaching in Dissenting chapels, and in some of those unhappy cases where clergymen have been barely acquitted of serious charges of immorality the state of their households has been notoriously such as would certainly bring them under condemnation by this law.

We fail, therefore, altogether to see the force of the objections which some excellent people have brought against the new law. Nothing is added to what every clergyman is now morally bound to do, and we may add that there is nothing required which every clergyman, whose heart is at all in his work, is not now endeavouring to carry out according to his own views. Moreover, the tendency of every commission is to be lenient, not severe. When the sorrows of wife and children and the disgrace to the family are urged, it demands a very firm grasp of principle and sense of what is due to the Church to enable those who sit in the seat of judgment to condemn. And in this case the difficulty will be made still greater by the accused being a brother clergyman, living, it may be, in the immediate neighbourhood of those who are to try him, and not improbably being personally known to them. We think, therefore, that all thought of the Act being used as an instrument of oppression or set in motion in doubtful cases may be laid aside. There is no fear on that score. The guilty are much more likely to escape under its provisions than the innocent to be condemned or accused. What the Act does is to assert more clearly than has been hitherto done that the Church recognizes that there is neglect of duties on the part of a clergyman for which he is liable to be called to legal account, just as in H.M.'s services the law recognizes an offence which would be described as conduct unworthy of a gentleman and an officer. If, after some experience of the working of the Act, its provisions are found faulty or defective, then it must be amended. It seems to us a great thing that a commencement has been made, and we trust that much which has been a reproach to the Church of England may now be rolled away.

If we look at the matter from the bishop's side, we shall better see the good which the Act is likely to effect. As it is, a bishop goes into a parish and inquires what is being done, for its moral and spiritual regeneration, and is told—Nothing.

What! Does the clergyman never visit the school and instruct the children? Oh no, he has never been seen inside its walls, and he has either handed it over to a school board, or threatens to do so. Does he never teach in the Sunday school, or prepare the young people for confirmation? Does he not visit the sick and the poor, or his parishioners generally; or has he not some organized system by which the ladies of the parish are encouraged to do something for their poorer neighbours? To all such and such like queries, in whatever line they may be made, there is the same negative response. The bishop feels the scandal, recognizes that the people are as a fact spiritually uncared for, that they are learning to despise the ministrations of the Church, and must be fast drifting into utter indifference, if not unbelief: he sends for the clergyman and seriously remonstrates with him. Upon which the clergyman turns round and defies him. He asserts that he has never been known to neglect or omit a service which the law enjoins; and so he calmly takes his hat and retreats, leaving the bishop sighing over his inability to do what he feels ought to be done. Here the new law will step in, and the bishop will be able to say: 'If we cannot see our way to some amicable adjustment, I must issue a commission, which will certainly be unpleasant for you, and may bring about consequences which you will dislike, as I may be compelled to appoint a curate to discharge the duties which you neglect. The greater the bishop's personal experience of parochial work, the more efficiently will he be able to deal with the difficulties of the situation; and it is a matter for real regret that at a crisis like this, when personal experience is more than ever needed, excellent men should be appointed to the office of a bishop who must gain their knowledge by failures, and possibly bring the Act into contempt from their entire ignorance of practically working a parish. But to revert; we are convinced that very few clergymen will be found callous to the rebukes and entreaties of a wise, sympathetic, and experienced bishop, and that it will be found that the reserve of power which the bishop will possess under the provisions of the new Act will enable him to do much which he now would seldom think of attempting. Hitherto, as he had no legal power, an incumbent might be tempted to think him meddling and interfering with that which was no concern of his, if he had spoken to him about his neglected parish; now he can do so no longer, and it is well to note that the bishop will have a responsibility for the neglected work in his diocese which

has not previously rested upon him. No longer can a bishop say, 'I would interfere if I could'; but if complaints reach him he can interfere if he will, and not only will the Church people in the parish concerned have a right to find fault if he refuses to set in motion what the law has prescribed, but the whole Church will condemn him for laxity. And as now the Bishop of London is really responsible for all the non-residence of the City clergy, so for the future will the various bishops be for neglected and ill-cared for parishes.

There are one or two points connected with passing the Act, and with some of its minor provisions, which we feel ought to be noticed. The Bishop of London has been accused of first misleading people, by the title of the Bill, as to the nature of the legislation which he was proposing, and then smuggling it through Parliament in a way which he never could have done had people known what he was about. His own words in Convocation two years since are the best refutation of the former part of this accusation: '—

'With regard to the title of the Bill, it ought to be remembered that the Pluralities Acts are Acts constantly touching the clergy at every point, and if any clergyman really wishes to know under what Acts he is working, he must go in very many cases to the Pluralities Acts. Those who have to work these things are quite aware of what those Acts are, and what ground they cover. The Bill is, and can be, nothing but a Bill to amend the Acts, and it is very important that having this character it should bear this title, because nothing is more misleading in the end, when you come to work an Act of Parliament, than to have a title which takes you away from the kindred Acts with which it has to be construed. It is not an Act standing by itself. If it were, the title might be considered misleading, but the title was chosen expressly for the purpose of leading all those who wish to apply the Act to look to the Acts which it professed to amend, and I do not know that any other title could have been chosen which would have the same effect. It may be said, perhaps, with some truth, that the original title of the Pluralities Acts was misleading, because the Pluralities Acts range over such a very wide field, and touch on many other matters besides the holding of benefices in plurality. That, I think, there is some truth in, but it is impossible to set it right in a Bill of this character. After the full public discussions that took place upon it, there can be no question that no Bill has gone from Convocation to Parliament which was made more public beforehand in the two Houses of Convocation than this was. The purpose of the Act is to amend the Pluralities Acts.'

To this it may be added that if the Bill passed more quietly through the two Houses of Parliament than its opponents liked, that cannot be urged against its friends as a fault.

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1883, pp. 162, 163

By some it has been set down as a fault that the stipends allotted to curates have been so much increased, and that, as this arises from the great addition to the population, the laity ought to be called upon to contribute the additional sums required. In the earlier part of this article we have given the reasons which required that these stipends should be raised, and we can only add that when the clergy are doing their work we do not doubt that there will be a response from their parishioners, and that they will be assisted in raising the sums required. But these are not cases which will come under the Act. Our experience is that those who give themselves heart and soul to fulfil the duties of their ministry are never left without friends to help except through their own fault.

Again, it has been urged as a serious fault that, when an incumbent is non-resident with the license of the bishop, he shall not be at liberty without the bishop's permission to resume the duties of his benefice until the expiration of such license. Such an objection seems to us to be unfair and one-sided. A curate is persuaded to take charge of a benefice for a definite time; the request may be made by the incumbent because he or a member of his family is sick, or because there have been disputes or scandals in the parish which it is thought his absence might heal. But, however this may be, it cannot be right to break the contract with the curate. Practically nothing has been easier hitherto than to do this: for the future it will not be possible without the sanction of the bishop.

In our opinion, the one special point to be kept steadily in view in all ecclesiastical legislation is the spiritual edification of the people. This can never be done if the temporal interests of the clergy or the separate interests of the laity have more than a due prominence given to them. Vested interests and freehold rights are valuable things in their way, but they are subordinate to the higher ends for which the Church exists, and we are satisfied that they will be best preserved by being never pushed into special prominence.

In conclusion we would remind our clerical readers that before the close of the year they will be called upon to elect one of the five commissioners who will have to adjudicate in all proceedings brought under this Act. It is therefore most important that they should choose wisely and carefully. Men are wanted who will subordinate all questions to the strictest rules of equity; who will judge without respect of person or of party; who have no special fads or crotchets

which they exalt into principles, and admire or condemn others by their agreement or disagreement with them in these matters. What is wanted is commissioners in whom all the clergy of the diocese have confidence; and we are satisfied that, if such are chosen, in the very few cases which will come before them it will be found that the interests of the Church have been safeguarded, whilst the special good of the Act will probably be found in the increased influence with which it will enable the Bishops to deal with those who are now insufficiently alive to the duties and responsibilities of their office.

ART. X.—LANSDELL'S 'RUSSIAN CENTRAL ASIA.'

1. *Russian Central Asia*. By HENRY LANSDELL, D.D. (London, 1885.)
2. *The Russian Revolt, &c.* By EDMUND NOBLE. (London, 1885.)

SINCE the father of history brought Scythæ and Agathyrsi, Chorasmii and Massagetæ, within the horizon of the Greek mind, involving in that bird's-eye view of the early world religion, ethnography, genealogy, politics, folk-lore, natural history, and legendary myths, we doubt whether a more complete book after its kind has been written than that of which the title is prefixed. The author's previous work, *Through Siberia*, may be said to have been the passport which carried him through on this later occasion. He became, through the details there given, a *grata persona* to Russian authorities. He found favour in the eyes of those who from S. Petersburg and Moscow have power to open or to close the routes into Central Asia, and that favour he turned to good account. His prime object in this, as in his previous journey, was the distribution of Holy Scripture, or portions of it, with other devotional works; and he makes due acknowledgment of help received from more than one society devoted to such objects. After passing from Nijni Novgorod by rail to Perm, and thence through the Urals *via* Ekaterineburg to Tiumen on the Tobol, thence down that river to where it joins the Irtysh (the two forming the Obi, the chief river of Western Siberia), and up again from the point of junction by steamer on the Irtysh to

Omsk and Semipolatsk, his route lay through Kuldja, Bokhara, Char-jui, thence north-westward to Khiva, and nearly skirted the sea of Aral's southern extremity, till the Caspian Sea was struck at Krasnovodsk on its eastern shore. After crossing which, he traversed the Caucasian region through Tiflis and Batoum to Odessa, whence he reached London on the shortest day in 1884, having covered over 12,000 miles in 179 days, or at an average of 101 miles a day. Our traveller has had more curious and less cursory eyes in view than those of the 'general reader' merely (although the most discursive skimmer may find much to interest him), since he designs also to furnish materials for the student, and yields, by the aid of various eminent hands whose co-operation he has secured, new objects of research to the scientific specialist. Thus he is enabled to add appendices on the fauna and flora of Central Asia, including lists with descriptions of Araneæ, Crustacea, Coleoptera, &c., of the Steppes and other regions traversed, contributed by various scientific naturalists, while other occasional notices of the flora and fauna are interspersed alike in text and notes. The imperial House of Romanoff appears, by the way, to contain a 'lepidopterist' of its own. The work is illustrated by a map showing line of route, and by not a few sketch-engravings and photographs. Notices of trades and manufactures, of commodities and their prices, of schools and institutions, of criminals and prisons, of routes and fares, of values and weights, of bills of fare and excise duties, also occur, with an occasional chapter from the progressive history of Russian annexation. Throughout the whole of this journey Dr. Lansdell was accompanied by a young physician, Dr. Alfred Sevier, who joined him from Vienna, just before he reached Perm, and only left him at Odessa. The chief *contre-temps* which occurred to them was in an early stage of their journey, occasioned partly by the author's omitting to mention, before leaving Perm, his wish to distribute at once his books, &c., partly by the officiousness of a gendarme and a badly worded telegram. He was, in short, a few hours in arrest under suspicion of being an agent of the Nihilist propaganda, who 'not only put seditious leaflets into duly authorized tracts to distribute, but I have heard, on good authority, of a Bible having been seen, beginning with Genesis and ending with Revelation, but filled in with—Nihilistic matter!' Dr. Lansdell's books, &c., were sent on before him to Tiumen, where he found them shipped by mistake for Tomsk, and narrowly escaped a month's delay by obviating the misdirection just in time—'packed in strong wooden boxes, iron-

hooped at the ends, and corded; and when I arrived and found thirty of them awaiting me, to say nothing of personal baggage and provisions, I confess to feeling a little alarmed at the burden prepared for my back. . . . They were printed in Russian, Slavonic, Hebrew, Chinese, Mongolian, Kirghese, Persian, Arabic, Turkish, Polish, German, and French.' At Tiumen a strong *telega*, or wagonette, in which to carry these, was obtained by an English friend whom Dr. Lansdell had known on his former Siberian journey. He conciliated, moreover, the favour of the Archbishop of Tobolsk, as well as of governors-general, mayors, postmasters, and others. In short, all the powers, civil, military, and ecclesiastical, seem to have been successfully secured; and the author notices with pleasure the fact that his books, even when given from hand to hand or sold in liquor-shops for drams, seem to have been well treated and neither defaced nor torn. Great industry in note-taking and writing while impressions were fresh are among the qualifications of Dr. Lansdell for a traveller, while as a distributor or *colporteur* on a grand scale he seems to have shown much tact and discretion, and to have a vigilant and discerning eye in detecting the leading traits of the native mind and character. The Kirghese population, partly settled, partly nomad, like the 'agricultural' and the 'nomad Scythians' of Herodotus, were taxed up to 1869 on their herds of cattle, which fact they have ever since made a reason for always understating these in their 'returns' to Government. 'But,' remarks our author, 'while a Kirghese gives the smallest figure for his own herds, he has no objection to tell the truth about those of his neighbours,' and thus 'it was judged by the Russians that . . . it was necessary to multiply the nomad returns by three' for some districts and 'by two' for others. The present unit of taxation among them is the *kibitka* (or tent), each of which pays 6s. a year, and full details of their excise duties, quit rents (for Cossacks), local rates, and military or other liabilities are given. Returns and statistics, however, gathered from the statement of semi-barbarians who count on their fingers, with a continuation on their toes, and then call into the notation their neighbours' fingers and toes, are noticed by the author as untrustworthy. He has been at great pains to collect statistics of the nationalities, classes, religions, &c., of the population, as furnished by Government; and speaks of the minuteness of the details required from every provincial governor. One of these enumerations (p. 108) strikes the reader who pauses to examine its figures as not a little 'mixed.' Thus, after enumerating the figures for each 'rank' of the

comm
per
cent.
how
much
have
'88 m
the r
the p
and t
nearl
the s
total
purel
whol
fixed
const
the p
But
from
Kirg
since
is, ho
on su
are r
A
leads
conta
sumi
most
prob
are l
powe
of ex
them
-energ
cepti
whol
ward
going
Gove
this l
and
to se
force

community, we find the percentages given as follows:—'90·85 per cent. were Kirghese; then followed the Cossacks, 4·31 per cent.; bourgeois, 1·85; peasants, 88; and soldiers, 88.' But how could there possibly be 88 per cent. of any other class, much less 88 per cent. of each of *two*, when *over 90 per cent.* have been assigned to the first-named? It seemed possible that '88 might have been intended, but even this will not complete the required 100 for the total of the percentages. Besides, the peasants have, in numbers, been just above given at 4,762, and the soldiers, under various items, at a total of 7,623, or nearly half as many again. How then could these yield the *same* percentage, whether 88, or '88, or 8·8, on the *same* total of population? Then follows a computation of the purely nomad Kirghese at 'little more than one-third of the whole,' the remainder not wandering 'in winter from their fixed quarters. The remaining 54,431 (or 10·67 per cent.) constitute the settled population.' Here 'the remaining' and the previous 'remainder' are not apparently the same item. But further, if 'the remaining' means that which 'remains' from the total population, 538,385, given previously, after the Kirghese, 489,134, have been deducted, the sum will not tally, since on so deducting there remain, not 57,431, but 49,251. This is, however, the only passage in which Dr. Lansdell ventures on such minute statistics, and for more reasons than one we are rather glad that it is so.

A lightly touched-in sketch of early Russian conquest leads one to remark that the hearts of great continents contain human society under its least changed forms. Assuming, then, Asia as the starting-point of humanity, the most primitive and rudimentary forms of that society may probably be looked for there. In their normal state these are loosely cohesive and readily absorbed by the nearest powerful organization—as the Russian. Only in a few periods of extraordinary swarming-over has mutual pressure forced them into powerful cohesion, and at the same time into an energetic impulse of forward movement. Barring such exceptional crises as serve thus to weld them into a mass, the whole tribal system is loose and friable. Russia presses forward, and the fugitive particles adhere to her. This has been going on since the sixteenth century. A report from the Governor of Siberia of gold to be found in Yarkand, although this lies considerably to the south of the Tian Shan mountains, and 500 miles or so east of Kashgar, induced Peter the Great to send 'a company of merchants in the train of his armed force with skilled persons . . . to purchase or even examine

the gold, where it was to be found, and in what quantity, also the roads leading thereto, and finally, even though it should be with difficulty, to seize that place.' Peter 'died before his gold-robbery could be carried out, but in this way was commenced the line of forts on the Irtysh.' The 'Sungarian kingdom,' exterminated by wholesale massacre by the Chinese in 1756, seems to have further cleared the way for Russian dominion. The Zaisan Lake, south of the Altai mountains, was for some time a post of jealous mutual observation between Chinese and Russian. But 'in 1822 the Cossack fisheries were extended to the Zaisan, and subsequently established to the exclusion of all others.' On completing his actual itinerary in chapter lxxii., Dr. Lansdell turns back to review the Turkomans of the Steppe and its oases in a series of chapters which have been 'revised by M. Lessar.' He discusses the origin, physiology, and characteristics of the Turkoman race, their tribes and subdivisions, next describes the oases of Akhal, Attek, Tejend, and Merv, notes an 'unknown country,' since become rather notorious than otherwise, between the Murgab and Heri Rud, passes on to Lomakin's defeats by the Akhal Tekkes, to Skobeleff's campaign and capture of Geok Tepe, describes Alikhanoff's penetration of Merv in disguise, and Merv itself 'as annexed,' with due comments on the lawlessness and atrocities of the Mervites. The explanations of the Moscow Gazette, and the suspicions, which henceforth probably no reassurances will ever quiet, of Russian intrigue, lead up to the 'present situation,' which again has been largely modified in Russian interests since Dr. Lansdell's book, recent as it is, was committed to the press. It is no part of the author's purpose to trace the differences between the leading ideas of Russian and British advance and dominion in Asia. The reader who is interested in this subject should refer to the even more recent work of Professor Vambéry in his *Coming Struggle for India*, being an account of the encroachments of Russia in Central Asia, and of the difficulties sure to arise therefrom to England. There we may see how the growth of Russian Asiatic power rests on conquest and annexation, lacks the elements of honesty and beneficence, which the Professor finds in British progress, and tends to debase and enslave those whom it approaches. Against this, M. Vambéry considers, 'it is only the solid rock of Anglo-Saxon character which will furnish the material for effective bulwarks.' The advance upon and seizure of Penjdeh, a fact accomplished since Dr. Lansdell wrote, was only the fulfilment of the idea which culminated in the seizure of Merv—

viz. to push a wedge between the Persian and Afghan frontiers, and find a station whence an advance on Herat might await its opportunity.

The illustration of Biblical customs with which Dr. Lansdell's book abounds is assisted by an 'index of texts illustrated.' They are necessarily of various degrees of interest; some, as the custom of the prince or chief 'sitting in the gate,' use of veils or half-veils among women, contention for wells, &c., being so well-known as to appear commonplace. Others are rare and striking:— as 'in the passage at the entrance of the palace was a narrow shelf on either side, which served as a sleeping-place for the guard and attendants,' illustrating 2 Sam. xi. 8, 9, 'Uriah . . . slept at the door of the king's house with all the servants of his lord, and went not down to his house' (i. pp. 127–8, and note). So the married Kirghese woman has her own tent, reminding one of 'his (Isaac's) mother Sarah's tent,' 'Leah's tent,' and 'Rachel's tent,' in Gen. xxiv. 67, xxxi. 3. To the list might have been added an illustration of Jeremiah the Prophet 'let down' by 'cords' into 'the dungeon' (Jer. xxxviii. 6, 12), derived from the 'lower dungeon' at Bokhara, i. 153, 'a deep pit, at least twenty feet deep, into which the culprits and their food are let down by ropes.' Many patriarchal and Jewish customs regarding marriage and divorce are said by our author to receive illustration among 'the Kirghese laws respecting marriage, family rights, the relation between man and wife, inheritance and division of property.' Thus the mission of Eliezer of Damascus, the 'Levirate' union, the division of inheritance by a father during his lifetime (Gen. xxv. 5, 6, to which S. Luke xv. 12 might have been added), and other such points are illustrated, ii. 330–2. At the same time the author notes that the Kirghese have not taken over intersexual law bodily from the Koran, which might account for the 'Levirate' law thus prevailing among them. This fairly suggests the inference that its prevalence is due to some earlier influence. The prevalence of towers of refuge, small, high, and with a narrow entry, may throw light on such expressions as 'my high tower and my refuge,' 2 Sam. xxii. 3. Such towers, it seems, are found in the Uzbeg region and in the Caucasus, and might possibly illustrate further that antiquarian puzzle, the Irish 'round towers' (ii. 322, and note). It is also there suggested that the apparently over-numerous 'cities' of Jair in Gilead, and those mentioned in various early books of Scripture, may have been only 'fortified farm-houses,' resembling the *havli* of the Uzbegs.

Under the guidance of Dr. Ginsburg, who duly 'coached' him in the marks of antiquity, the author laid himself out for the chance of purchasing Hebrew manuscripts. He met with one at Moscow, then newly arrived from Bokhara, which he subsequently, as we shall further see, visited on his travels, with a rather fabulous price, 500*l.*, named for it. On the author propounding his tests of its antiquity to the Rabbi who showed it, the latter remarked to his co-rabbi, 'That's a knowing fellow!' in German, as a safe 'aside,' presumed by the speaker *not* to be a tongue known to its subject! On reaching Bokhara he found the Jew or Jewess who had sold it, as was there thought, for 100*l.*, and adds:—

'When I arrived in England I chanced to meet Dr. Ginsburg at the British Museum, and was informing him of the treasure I had met, when I was told that, if I would come downstairs, I could perhaps see it again. I did so, and there it was! The owner had brought it all the way from Bokhara to London, and now it enriches our national collection' (i. pp. 115-6).

It turned out to carry its own date, one equivalent to '1483 A.D. from Lisbon,' thus fully justifying Dr. Lansdell's impeachment of its high antiquity, and to contain some various readings in its margin from renowned recensions. It is now numbered 'Oriental 2626-8' in the British Museum Catalogue, and regarded as the most richly illuminated Hebrew manuscript of the Old Testament in the world. How it got from Lisbon to Bokhara is a question which may be asked, but to which no answer is suggested. The author devotes chapter xli. to 'the Jews of Bokhara,' oppressed by contemptuous Muhammadans there, showing how he visited their synagogues, and, with Dr. Sevier's help, doctored their sick, at the risk of offending Moslem sensitiveness, and wrote on their behalf to the local Emir, with a humane wish to improve their condition. At Kuldja, the most easterly point which he reached, on the higher waters of the Ili, a Chinese river, he found a small colony of Roman Catholics, to whom, at their request, he gave a religious service, besides selling there numerous copies of the Scriptures. This was before reaching Bokhara. He gives copious notices of the Ili valley, its ethnology, &c. At Bokhara, the description of the Emir's reception and the author's stay at Kitab, his summer residence, is one of the most graphic bits of Oriental reading which the Western world has seen. It leaves an impression of showy splendour and meanness, as well as of mental feebleness and suspiciousness of character, only combined under the shadow of an Eastern throne. Probably the Emir did not in the least

believe Dr. Lansdell's statement of the purpose of his journey, but viewed him as a diplomatic spy, and treated him with as much suspicion as he dared to show. In the capital he was specially hampered by the perverse officiousness of the 'Kush-beggi,' a shifty old intriguer, whose post is analogous to that of Grand Vizier, and whose apartments had two glass windows and a French clock. Besides which, the grand area of the capital contains, in one of two lofty towers, 'the clock made by Giovanni Orlandi, who fell into the hands of Nasr-Ullah, and, when condemned to death because he would not turn Mussulman, was pardoned on promising to make the despot a machine for measuring time.' With this compare the statement, current in most histories, that the first clock known in the West was a present from the famous Haroun-al-Raschid to Charlemagne. If *both* are correct, the Orientals would seem to have lost the tradition of clock-making. At Bokhara our traveller, on whom his persistent note-taking fixed the character of a spy, saw the chief mosque, visited the school, asked to go up the tallest minaret and visit the prison, but was refused, gave lectures in elementary astronomy in illustration of 'the empire on which the sun never sets'—'Surely it must set for a few hours?' interposed one of the neophytes—estimated the value of Bokhariot commerce in hard cash, and speculated on the number of the Emir's wives—a question variously answered, from 300 to fifty or sixty, 'but never more than four (the orthodox Mussulman limit) at one time.' He managed, however, to see a prison at Charjui, the next halting-place,

'situated under a chamber at the gate of the fortress . . . about 10 feet square by 5 feet high. The one doorway was 3 feet high and 18 inches wide, and through it I crept into the dismal den, which had no window or ventilator, so that, when the door was shut, it was a veritable "black hole" of Calcutta, while the only thing in the chamber was a thick beam down the centre of the earthen floor, wherein the feet of the prisoners might be confined. Six prisoners were under arrest, wearing iron collars, through the ends of which a chain was passed to secure them all together, and with a spike at the end to fasten into the wall.'

The author calculated that on the night of his visit there were eleven persons within 500 cubic feet of air, about half what each person in Newgate is allowed, and adds: 'The only good things I remember about the prison were, that it was dry and fairly clean, nor did I detect any unpleasant smell.' According to a Russian authority, although the slave markets of Bokhara are officially closed and the trade strictly pro-

hibited, 'yet slaves are bought and sold with perfect freedom in all parts of the country,' the Emir himself being a large purchaser. This potentate, really a vassal of Russia, whose dominions may probably be reduced to a province at the next demise, although he kept Dr. Lansdell while in Bokhara under a constant 'guard of honour,' yet made the amplest provision for his entertainment, and loaded him with presents at parting.

The episode which gives most variety to the book is perhaps the voyage of 300 miles down the Oxus, from Carjui to the last bend of the river above Petro-Alexandrovsk, which the author tried to cut short by disembarking, and, with his friend the Doctor and two Bokhariot comrades, riding into the last-named town. They took this at starting for a nine miles distance, but found it twenty-seven before they had finished it. The conveyance for this river voyage was a boat of the district, which carried their *tarantass*, or travelling carriage, stuck amidships, horses in the stern, oarsmen forward, and passengers in the interstices, to whom were added two body-guards, and a horse-escort on the bank, for fear of Turkoman robbers. They encountered, however, no such perils, although in one part of the course the men were shy of travelling after dark. They found the water always muddy from undermining its banks, which fell in with a sound 'like the booming of distant guns,' yet drinkable when allowed to settle. They met with every needful civility from the 'Beks,' or provincial magnates. One, being stingy, sent no presents; another, being zealous, sent a 'mirza,' or officer, to represent him and accompany the voyagers, of whom the author took occasion to inquire his notions of a future life. A bodily resurrection formed part of his belief, 'the dead growing out of the earth like grass.' In heaven, although every wish would be gratified, yet the 'creditor,' he believed, 'might seek out his debtor, and though he could not demand his money, yet if the debtor were a good man and the creditor a sinner, the creditor might take away the virtue of all the debtor's good deeds, so appropriating them as to be saved thereby.' The voyage had its diversions in the form of an occasional alarm of wolves, or an occasional run upon a mud bank, with here and there excursions to examine the vegetation or the natural history, for which Dr. Lansdell seems always to find room. One chapter of his book, after a solemn and touching story, reported by the Bible Society, of the conversion of a worldly and blasphemous character by some words of the 1st Psalm, which, once seen casually, seem to have burnt themselves

into
Sca
som
car
des
bes
geo

tere
Am
ing
for
ma
two
the
and
of
gra
con
to l
pre
any
in t
Sir
(14
the
of t
if t
reop
dec
Cas
ably
with
part
be t
iden
four
Rus
sinc
roac
repo
the
Dep
now
eng

into the man's memory, concludes with a discussion on the *Scaphyrhynchus*, a fish allied to the sturgeon, and resembling some North-American variety of that fish, a 'ganoid, with cartilaginous skeleton,' of whose peculiar features an elaborate description is given in the note, taken from a Russian naturalist, besides a sketch of its relation to other groups, and early geological epochs, in the text.

Closely connected with this bit of navigation is the interesting question of the ancient course of the Oxus, now Amu Daria, which seems to have been inconstant, fluctuating at different periods between the Caspian and the Aral Sea for its outlet. Dr. Lansdell ably sums up the evidence, which may be rough-sketched as follows: Firstly, for a period of twelve centuries, midway in which stands the Christian era, the Aral Sea is unknown and unnamed alike by Greek, Latin, and Persian writers. Then follows for 700 years 'a consensus of testimony exactly in the opposite direction,' Arab geographers placing the Oxus outlet then in the Aral. Then comes a period of two centuries, during which several missions to Mongolia from European Courts have left records. They presumably traversed the Aral region, but none of them knows anything of that sea. This is negative evidence merely; but in the mid-period of these same records a Persian MS., *teste* Sir H. Rawlinson, directly notices the Caspian as the then (1417) outlet of the Oxus, whereas ancient books gave it as the Kharezmi (= Aral), 'which no longer exists.' In the time of the English traveller Jenkinson (1588) the record looks as if the river had ploughed its way again to the Aral and reopened that reservoir. By 1717 the evidence becomes decided that the Aral was again the outlet, the dry old Caspian bed being mentioned by successive travellers. Probably subsidence and upheaval alternating have had to do with this. If the Caspian-Aral region is the most depressed part of the entire continent, pressure from below upward would be first felt there. The old bed, however, has not been always identical, even when the Caspian was its exit. Three, if not four, lines of course of the Oxus are said to be traceable. The Russians have surveyed the region more than once or twice, since to reopen the Caspian Oxus would give them a straight road by its conduit to Afghanistan. Their surveyors, however, report an existing depression in the way which would absorb the entire volume of the Oxus and the Aral Sea together. Depression is just there, perhaps, at or near its maximum just now. Given a new innings of elevation, and future Russian engineers may then hope to score. Thus the lower Oxus bed

may be viewed as a great index on nature's dial, measuring the forces of local oscillation from below. A perhaps similar 'enormous bay or horse-shoe depression apparently of the sea' is recorded (ii. p. 417, and note) as traversed, on the elevated plateau between the Aral and the Caspian, by Dr. Lansdell himself, bounded by a cliff, on peeping over which all the features of a wave-torn coast line were visible, in 'caves, grottoes, coves, and caverns.' On this vacant sea-bed the travellers encamping found herbage 'so scanty and distasteful' that the horses refused it. Its further limit, ascended by the travellers on quitting it, was a line of 'chalky cliffs worn into the resemblance of a chain of snow mountains.' It was the Bay of Kaplan Kir, perhaps a remnant of 'the great Central Asian Sea that geologists talk of'; and the writer believes he was the first Englishman that gazed upon it. Then followed a monotonous journey, during which the strain of bodily exhaustion and mental vacuity began to tell. The latter the author relieved by galloping forward to herbage, where possible to find any, for his steed to crop, then taking out a pocket bible and marking (in all more than 500) the passages on which his present and previous travels had thrown light. Then, after letting the caravan pass on till nearly out of sight, while he pursued his studies, he would gallop forward and catch them up. They were now nearing the end of their journey, and another stage or two brought them in sight of the Caspian, which they hailed with a shout like that of 'Θάλαττα, Θάλαττα!' from the Greeks of the *Anabasis* at view of the Euxine. Krasnovodsk, the Caspian passage, Baku and its oil, thence to Tiflis in a horse-box, Bible distribution there, and the outlook from Batoum, thence by the Euxine and Sea of Marmora to Odessa, *longæ finem chartæque viæque*, are despatched in the last chapter.

There are one or two characteristic episodes of desert travelling which shall find place here. After providing for his transport at Kunia Urgenj, in the Khivan region, the author records:—

'I confess to being a little disappointed at the look of the camels hired for us. I had given the best price, that he might secure the best animals, which I supposed to be the graceful, long-haired, two-humped Bactrian camel. Instead of this appeared five short-haired, one-humped, gaunt-looking creatures, of anything but attractive appearance. I was reconciled, however, to the new animals on Yakooob's telling me that the one-humped animals are stronger than the two-humped.'

The sequel of course revealed the smartness of the gang of Asiatics, whose services as guides or escorts Dr. Lansdell had accepted, in practising on the easy confidence of the latter—not that they served him one scruple less smartly than horse-dealers would serve a foreigner, or native either for that matter, if they only could, in England. A little earlier it was found that 'secondhand rope, according to Yakoob's account, kept rising in price.' When an Englishman with Russian patronage and easygoing ways, supposed therefore to have the resources of both empires at his back, has to trust the chapmanship of the children of the East, they discern by instinct that the day of fortune has arrived for them—'the hour has come and the man'—and up goes the price of old rope and of anything else probably wanted urgently at the moment, and large gaps appear between sums paid and those actually received for camels. No wonder the 'two humps' condensed into one and the hair shortened its dimensions. As soon as a section of the guides, &c., are paid off and sent home, the retained residue begin to 'peach' upon them, how melons and ropes were stolen, and the best of the transit bargain secured by the delinquents whose backs were now effectually turned—not that one need go *super et Garamantas et Indos* to find such homely illustrations of human nature's frailty. The following, however, is more strictly Oriental. Dr. Lansdell had dined on the second day after leaving Kunia, and, experiencing Turkoman hospitality, pleaded repletion; he continues:—

'Here I forgot that being able to eat no more is a mere figure of speech to a Turkoman, and I am afraid that my host either thought me rude, or attributed my refusal to national or religious exclusiveness, for he gave a polyglot grunt that would be understandable in any language, and appeared to be huffed.'

Further on we find the author, by a process which again required no dragoman to assist its meaning, making it plain to the native mind that there were limits to his easy good nature. The successors of the dismissed guides, &c., turned out worse than the previous lot who had fleeced him and did their work, the others containing at any rate one blacker sheep, who fleeced him and did it not—one Murad, reported by Rosy, who appeared to carry something resembling a conscience, for stealing nearly half the store of bread:—

'I adopted therefore a corrective idea from Captain Burnaby's book, and holding up the bag with the remaining cakes before Murad's face, I addressed him in English, and, to make it understandable, I administered on his back two or three sharp cuts with my

VOL. XXI.—NO. XLI.

N

horsewhip. . . . I know not whether this narrative may cause some to think that I was forgetting my profession, but I acted advisedly, and thought I was right. We were not yet halfway to the Caspian, and if I did not in some way establish my authority, we might have half our provisions stolen. There was no policeman, magistrate, or bek within scores of miles, and I could not rid myself of the thief either by advance or by retreat.

Some interesting chapters towards the close of vol. i, reopen the vexed question of Russian prison discipline. As regards Dr. Lansdell's personal testimony, it may be accepted without qualification. As regards what he was shown and what he was told by the authorities, there must ever linger a reserve in accepting them, because there is a suspicion of reserve on the side of the showers and tellers. So far as power is arbitrary, secrecy will always be one of its conditions of self-preservation. Further, the Russian Government, probably more than others, has to do with culprits or suspects, to whom secrecy is the very breath of life, and who, having elevated wholesale murder to a branch of political science, are utterly reckless how many innocent victims they massacre, to insure, or even have a chance of cutting off one doomed by their secret code as guilty. Whether any government thus handicapped in the struggle to save society from wreck would be likely to make a clean breast of it to an inquiring traveller, is matter of doubt, *et dubitatio ista non tollitur* (as old Aldrich used to say) by anything in these volumes. At the same time their author's challenge is manly and fair.

'When persons have told me of such things [as Prince Krapotkin asserts], I used to ask the question, "Out of the hundreds of prisoners who have passed through the fortress [of SS. Peter and Paul in S. Petersburg], do you know of one who has asserted that he was put to torture?" and an affirmative answer has not been forthcoming. If torture in the fortress is inflicted, can no one be found to tell us, with some closeness of detail, *when, where, and how* he was made to suffer? Such things, if done, could not have been hid. Further, Robinson [author's pseudonym for a real prisoner] had a friend who had been four times in the fortress, and many other acquaintances likely to know the truth, but none of these had ever spoken to him of cruelties enacted there.'

The same of course applies to *cachots, oubliettes*, &c., as to torture. Dr. Lansdell admits that 'respecting sickness, deaths, or insanity in the fortress,' he has 'no information.' There further remains the question, how far what he saw and heard in S. Petersburg, even assuming that it was exhaustive and

true
the
of h
also
scrib
gove
not
war
to r
ques
and
rest
itsel
proc
eyes
adeq
of ca
befor
only
M
type
ment
trave
his fa
precis
of pe
appea
a 'Sp
years
goes
tive a
further
the M
into t
dismi
lished
'M
under
how s
friendl
breakin
prison
acquitt

true, is a fair sample of what goes on in the other parts of the Empire. As regards Siberia, there is the direct testimony of his previous book, qualified by the doubt above suggested; also several prisons in Omsk and Semipolatsinsk, &c., are described in chap. xlv. of the present work. The provincial governors and their deputies under arbitrary governments not rarely do things which the central authority would not warrant, and trust to a successful raid on some nest of plotters to redeem their credit and insure their impunity. The whole question is one which has many secret chambers of subterfuge and dark sinuous mazes of evasion. Behind all which there rests the further question of the administration of justice itself, of the fairness of the methods, and openness of the process. For how much does strong suspicion count in the eyes of a despot's ministers? is a question which could only adequately be answered by sifting the details of a multitude of cases. For this of course it is impossible that the volumes before us could contain materials. We indicate the question only before laying down the pen.

Mr. Noble's book has reached us since the above was in type. He quotes approvingly Prince Krapotkin's arraignment of the Russian judicial system.¹ He seems to have travelled in Russia, but to what extent his travels furnished his facts does not appear. His most recent allegations lack preciseness of date. But he says that up to 1881 'thousands of people' were sent 'to Siberia without trial'—simply disappearing without information to their relatives. Since then a 'Special Commission' must approve the sentence, and five years is the limit of exile. Thus qualified, the system still goes on, and Mr. Noble implies that these purely administrative *coups de police* take the place of any public trial. He further cites an over-candid Report of M. Paul Birvansky to the Minister of Justice, who sent him to Orenburg to inquire into the tribunals there, which Report procured him speedy dismissal from his functions, and cost the journal² which published the same its suspension. Some of it is as follows:—

'My inquiry revealed to me how our judges trample the laws under foot; how cynical and wanton is the behaviour of our police; how savagely brute force is brought to bear upon the weak and friendless. I lived in an atmosphere of appalling groans and heart-breaking sighs. I liberated innocent persons who had been kept in prison by the executive several years after they had been publicly acquitted in open court, and who had been secretly tortured. I took

¹ *Nineteenth Century*, January 1883.

² The *Sgovernny Vyestnik* (Northern Messenger).

down the depositions of peasant women who had been subjected to torment—their flesh pinched with red-hot tongs—by order and in the presence of the chief commissary of police, merely because they had presumed to plead on behalf of their unfortunate husbands.'

He describes the 'State prisons' as 'loathsome dens' where 'hundreds die lingering deaths' or 'emerge' from them 'crippled for life. . . . The confined atmosphere, poisoned by exhalations from every sort of abomination, absolutely stopped my breath, so rank and fetid it was' (pp. 242-5). In short, his allegations bear out the worst atrocities described by Prince Krapotkin, Stepniak, and Madame C—— in the *Nineteenth Century* for January 1883. Now, as the title of the newspaper is given, why could not the date be added? The official Report, too, must have been formally dated. Instead of dating his charges, Mr. Noble is content to say, this happened 'not very long ago.' Thus we still lack precise information whether any very recent reforms may have had the effect of reconciling his statements with those of Dr. Lansdell.

We take leave of Dr. Lansdell's book with a strong sense of its honesty and fairness, together with graphic power and easy style, as well as of the commendable zeal of the writer in the cause to which he gave himself. If anyone wants to see a very different picture, that of an earlier traveller not privileged by Imperial favour, not waited on, escorted, fêted, or caressed, not provisioned by rations of royalty, or served by forced labour levied from the inhabitants—we say this utterly without prejudice to the humanity or self-denial of Dr. Lansdell—let him turn to the adventures of Dr. Wolff in his Bokhara mission of 1843-6.

IN
ant
the
whi
brie
mac
the
cha
wor
resu
if w
thin
pres
deeq
the
form
fidel
reas
plain
som
have
ract
no v
sion
I
rang
para
grea
para
early
as a
first
it ha

ART. XI.—THE REVISED VERSION OF
THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SECOND ARTICLE.

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments translated out of the Original Tongues; being the Version set forth A.D. 1611 compared with the most Ancient Authorities and Revised. (Oxford and Cambridge, 1885.)

IN our last number we gave some account of the origin and antecedents of the Revised Version; traced the growth of the English Bible through the century of change and progress which ended with the publication of King James's Version; briefly indicated some of the principal reasons which have made a revision of that noble work desirable; and sketched the history of the Hebrew text, with the view of showing the character of the foundation upon which the Revisers had to work. In the present article we propose to consider the result of their labours; and at the outset we wish to say, that if we venture to criticize some of their conclusions, and to think that they have not dealt with some of the problems presented to them with sufficient courage, we are nevertheless deeply sensible that all English readers of the Bible owe them the warmest thanks for their self-denying and laborious performance of the duties entrusted to them. The gain in fidelity and lucidity is solid and substantial, and it is more reasonable to be grateful for what is given us than to complain that it is not all that we could have desired. But something more of critical accuracy might, we are persuaded, have been aimed at, and attained without sacrificing the characteristic excellences of the Authorized Version. We have no wish to depreciate the great merits of the Revised Version, but its defects must also be fairly faced and estimated.

I. A few preliminary words about Externals. The arrangement of the text in paragraphs, with a space before the paragraph 'where the change of subject seemed to require a greater break than was marked by the beginning of a new paragraph,' is in substance only a return to the practice of our early Versions. The unfortunate plan of treating each verse as a separate paragraph is said by Dr. Scrivener to have been first introduced in the Genevan New Testament of 1557; and it has unquestionably been most detrimental to the connected

understanding of Holy Scripture. But it is a great pity that the Revisers did not further adopt a system of sub-paragraphs to indicate the sub-divisions which are to be found in almost every paragraph, and attract attention to the abrupt transitions of thought which are so common in the Old Testament, and which form a frequent stumbling-block to the English reader. In Ps. ii. for example, the reader is greatly helped by the division into strophes; but in Psalm xviii. he is left without any resting-place from beginning to end. The divisions no doubt are not so sharply defined as in Psalm ii., but they are sufficiently well marked, and it would have been most helpful to have them visibly shown. In the Book of Job and in the Prophets the need for some such assistance is still more urgent. And why should not the words of a speaker have been indicated by the use of inverted commas in such passages as Ps. xlv. 10, and Ps. lxxv. 2-5, where God is abruptly introduced as the speaker; or in Job xxxiv. 31, 32; or in the dialogues in the Song of Solomon and the last chapter of Hosea? It might be said that in so doing the translator would in many cases be usurping the office of the commentator. True; but in translating the Old Testament he must frequently do so to some extent, if he is to make his translation intelligible to the ordinary reader.

The headings of the chapters stand on a different footing. The company was originally commissioned to revise them, but wisely abandoned the task. However useful they may have been in certain cases, in others they could not fail to imply a particular and often unduly limited line of interpretation. To stamp this with authority would have been misleading.

The arrangement in paragraphs enables the Revisers to correct wrong divisions of chapters in the Authorized Version, though the old numbering of chapters and verses is necessarily retained for purposes of reference. For example, the section which treats of the 'guilt-offering' in Leviticus (v. 14-vi. 7) was arbitrarily divided between two chapters in the Authorized Version, which here unfortunately deserted the Hebrew and followed the Septuagint and Vulgate; Hos. ii. 1 clearly belongs to the conclusion of ch. i., and ii. 2 begins a new address; Hos. xi. 12 is closely connected with xii. 1; and, most important case of all, the great prophecy of the suffering servant of the Lord, in Isa. lii. 12-liii., was torn asunder in a way which 'separates the theme from its commentary.'¹

¹ But surely this section ought to have been marked off by itself in the Revised Version as a distinct division by spaces before and after it.

The arrangement of the poetical books, and the fragments of poetry in the prose books, in lines, 'so as to exhibit the parallelism which is characteristic of Hebrew poetry,' is a great advantage. Here and there a mistake has crept in by some accident, as in Job xiv. 7, which should certainly be arranged in accordance with the Hebrew accents as a tristich, like verses 12-14, thus:

'For there is hope for a tree;
If it be cut down, it will sprout again,
And its tender branch will not cease.'

II. From external matters of division and arrangement we pass to the important question of Style. To this the Revisers paid special attention, and we believe it is generally admitted that their efforts have been eminently successful. The general colouring of the Version remains unchanged: not a few phrases have been wholly recast, not a few new words introduced,¹ but there is no uncomfortable sense of incongruity or patchwork in the result. Here and there defects and blemishes can be picked out. In Job xxxiv. 14, 'if he set his heart upon man,' is a literal translation, retained from the Authorized Version, of a phrase which means 'closely observe,' and the rendering conveys a false impression.² In verse 29 of the same chapter, 'alike' stands very awkwardly at the end of the verse. In Job xxxv. 3,

'Thou sayest, What advantage will it be unto thee?
And, What profit shall I have, more than if I had sinned?'

the exact reproduction of the Hebrew, which according to a common idiom has the indirect form of expression in the first hemistich, and the direct form in the second, is liable to be misunderstood. In Gen. xv. 2 (apart from any question of the right rendering of an extremely obscure and possibly

¹ Just for curiosity, the reader may like some specimens. The list does not pretend to be complete:—Arrogant, askance, bargain, baggage, basilisk, broom, caravan, castanets, cavil (*vñ.*), chirp, claim, clasp, commentary, confines, confront, consternation, delve, deposit (*sd.*), expiate, exult, foray, gaunt, gecko, godless, harass, indictment, lotus, memorable, muscle, outrageous, palanquin, papyrus, pinions, pile (*vñ.*), porcupine, rabble, reservoir, rival, shaft (of a mine), saltwort, signature, soar, solace, spelt, teraphim, throb, tumour, tubes, turban; to which add from the margin: assailant, barricade, condescension, crawl, curds, district, enormity, forestall, obelisk, phoenix, restive, secretary, sistra, startle, vampire, vindicator.

² But the marginal rendering is probably right, and offers a very striking thought. 'If God set his mind upon himself'; if, that is, He were to consider Himself alone, and withdrawing His sustaining power from the universe, retire into a self-centered existence, all flesh would perish. The existence of creation is a proof of the benevolence of God.

corrupt phrase) how is the English reader to know that *Dam-mesek* is the Hebrew form of *Damascus*?

But we need not dwell on such comparative trifles. It is a graver question, however, whether the Revisers have not been too conservative in their retention of archaisms.

'The principle by which they have been guided,' as they tell us in their Preface, 'has been clear and consistent. Where an archaic word or expression was liable to be misunderstood or at least was not perfectly intelligible, they have substituted for it another, in equally good use at the time the Authorized Version was made, and expressing all that the archaism was intended to convey, but more familiar to the modern reader.'

The principle is excellent, and accounts satisfactorily for the disappearance of such obsolete or misleading words as *artillery*, *carriage* (*i.e.* baggage), *curious* (*i.e.* cunningly wrought), *deals* (*i.e.* portions), *ear* (*i.e.* plough), *leasing*, *meat-offering*, *nephew* (*i.e.* grandson), *peep* (*i.e.* chirp), *road* (*i.e.* raid), *tache*, *taken with the manner* (*i.e.* taken in the act), *witty*, and the like. But it must be remembered that the Revised Version is not designed to be a critical companion to the Authorized Version for the use of students or educated readers—if it was, it should have been carried out on a very different plan with far greater freedom—but a version for popular and general use. Can it be maintained that the following words will be 'perfectly intelligible' to the ordinary reader: *amerce*, *bewray*, *bruit*, *clouts*, *daysman*, *eschew*, *inward* (*i.e.* intimate), *neesings*, *occurent*, *ouches*, *sith*, *stomacher*, *tabering*, *woe worth*? Can it be maintained that the following words will not be 'liable to be misunderstood,' in some cases seriously: *amiable* (*i.e.* lovely), 'come down against' (*i.e.* to meet), 'bunches of camels,' *carefulness* (*i.e.* anxiety), *chargeable* (corrected to *burdensome* in 2 Sam. xiii. 25, but left in Nehem. v. 15), *charger*, *confectionaries* (*i.e.* perfumers), *conversant*, *conversation*¹ (this is really unpardonable; in Ps. xxxvii. 14 'such as be of upright conversation' is very properly altered to 'such as be upright in the way,' but in Ps. l. 23 'conversation' is left, with a marginal note 'Heb. way'), *demand* (*i.e.* ask, without any special emphasis), *fan* (*i.e.* winnow), *fats* (*i.e.* vats), 'find grace,' 'went hard unto the door' (*i.e.* close), *let* (*i.e.* hinder), *lust* (*i.e.* desire), *presently* (*i.e.* immediately), *prevent* (*i.e.* anticipate), *shroud*, *solemn* (*i.e.* *sollennis*, stated), *stuff* (as in 1 Sam. x. 22),

¹ How completely different was the use of this word in the seventeenth century from the sense it has now may be well illustrated from the *Pilgrim's Progress*, where it is said of *Talkative*: 'Religion hath no place in his heart, or house, or conversation; all he hath lieth in his tongue.'

take thought (*i.e.* be anxious), tell (*i.e.* count), targets (*i.e.* shields), 'tired her head,' 'vain men' (*i.e.* worthless)? Antiquarian conservatism has certainly outweighed practical utility in such cases as these. The words are obsolete, or, still worse, have changed their meaning; their retention will not give them a new lease of life, nor would their abandonment have impoverished the language; they would have existed as literary curiosities. Adaptation to present use does not here, as too often in the case of a building, involve destruction of the old. Still, the Revisers have erred on the right side; and we cannot feel too grateful to them for having firmly resisted the wholesale modernization of diction which the American company advocated.

The Revised Version will, we venture to think, commend itself to the English public by its style and diction. Does it, however, offer them an exact and faithful representation of the original, according to the ascertained results of modern scholarship?

III. And here the first question to be asked is, How have the Revisers dealt with the Text? Readers of the article in our last number will be aware how entirely different are the problems of Textual Criticism in the Old Testament from those of the New Testament. All known Hebrew manuscripts, none of which are certainly older than the tenth century A.D., agree in giving the recension known as the Massoretic text with but trifling variations. The vowel points, though probably representing an ancient exegetical tradition and method of reading, were not added to the consonantal text until the seventh or eighth century A.D.; while the accents, which, it will be remembered, form an elaborate system of interpunctuation, are somewhat later still. Internal evidence and the comparison of parallel passages prove that this Massoretic text cannot be credited with that high degree of integrity, in fact almost absolute freedom from corruption, which has been, and in many quarters still is, attributed to it. There is a growing feeling among scholars that, in the absence of other evidence, the testimony of the ancient Versions must be allowed to have great weight, and that in some cases conjecture may not be altogether out of place. The Revisers recognize the change of critical opinion since 1611; they virtually admit in their Preface that the Massoretic text is far from satisfactory; in an appreciable number of cases they have adopted the reading of a Version in preference to that of the Massoretic text; they have placed in the margin a considerable number of various readings from the ancient Ver-

sions ; and in a few desperate passages they candidly confess by a marginal note that the Hebrew text is 'obscure,' 'probably corrupt,' or 'faulty.' We are grateful to them for having admitted an important principle. We entirely fail to see why the rules of grammar and logic should be strained to the breaking point in order to extract a sense from the Hebrew text, when the Versions give a satisfactory meaning, which there is every reason to believe is the translation of a text far older and better than the Massoretic text. The canon of criticism, that 'the more difficult reading is to be preferred,' is perfectly sound for the New Testament, where there is first-rate documentary evidence ; but it must not be indiscriminately applied in the Old Testament. Internal evidence is no doubt precarious, and we have no other means of deciding between the readings of the Hebrew text and the Versions : much must depend on critical and exegetical tact ; but, considering the history of the Hebrew text, we cannot admit that it has any claim to an authority which may not be challenged. Nor ought the Christian Church to feel any difficulty about preferring to the traditions of the Synagogue readings which were adopted by the Apostles, if not by our Blessed Lord Himself.

We fully agree with the Revisers that 'an entire reconstruction of the text on the authority of the Versions' is at present out of the question ; but we believe that the list of 'exceptional cases' in which the Massoretic text has been deserted ought to have been considerably enlarged, and that many other readings from the Versions have at least as good a right to a place in the margin as those which are found there. We proceed to examine a few cases in which changes of text have been adopted. In Judges xviii. 30 *Moses* is now correctly read in place of *Manasseh*, which is the traditional reading of the Hebrew text. The *n* which so far as the consonants are concerned converts *Moses* into *Manasseh* is, according to the Massoretic tradition, 'suspended,' or written above the line—a fact which at once casts suspicion on its genuineness ; and there can be little or no doubt that the change was made to avoid the disgrace which might seem to attach to the great Lawgiver from the idolatries of his descendant. In Ps. xvi. 2 the Revisers have rightly deserted the vowels of the Hebrew text, which reads *thou hast said*, and can only be rendered by the violent expedient of supplying *O my soul*, and have adopted *I have said*, which is the reading of the LXX, Vulgate, and Syriac, and only requires a different punctuation of the Hebrew consonants. In Ps. xxiv. 6 they make sense of an otherwise unintelligible passage

by reading (as did the translators of 1611 in the margin), *God of Jacob* instead of *Jacob*, with the same Versions. In 1 Chron. vi. 28 *Vashni*, which is nothing but a corruption of the Hebrew word for *and the second*, is rightly so translated, and the name of Samuel's firstborn son *Joel* is restored from 1 Sam. viii. 2. In this case the corruption is older than the LXX, and the Syriac is the only version which supports an absolutely necessary correction. But the most important case in the whole of the Old Testament in which the reading of the Versions is accepted by the Revisers (as it had already been in the Authorized Version) is Psalm xxii. 16. The Hebrew word corresponding to *they pierced*, as read and pointed, means *like a lion*, and can mean nothing else. That

'Like a lion [they attacked] my hands and my feet'

is a most unsatisfactory sense would never have been denied, had not the passage an important prophetic reference, and the critical question been complicated by a dogmatic interest. But *all* the ancient Versions represent a verb, some rendering *pierced* (literally *dug into*), some *outraged* or *bound*; and a very slight change in the Hebrew word gives the sense *pierced*,¹ which the Revisers rightly retain, though candour requires them to state in the margin that it is not a rendering of the present Hebrew text.

But if the Revisers have deserted the Hebrew text in such cases as these, why, we are compelled to ask, have they not done so in many more instances, where they have only put the variant reading in the margin, although the Hebrew text calls just as urgently for correction? Take for example Gen. iv. 8, 'and Cain told Abel his brother.' The word rendered *told* in the text properly means (as the margin informs us) *said unto*, and should be followed by the speaker's words. In the Samaritan Pentateuch, LXX, Vulgate, Syriac, and Jerusalem Targum follow the words 'Let us go into the field,' which satisfy the grammatical requirements of the preceding verb, and explain the following verse. The Revisers ought to have placed them in the text. In Gen. xlix. 20 the preposition *out of* before *Asher* is extremely awkward, while the same letter is wanting at the end of verse 19 to express *their*, which is not in the Hebrew. The words have been

¹ כָּאֵרֶץ, to be read כָּאֵרֶץ or כָּאֵרֶץ. The LXX gives ἀρπάζαν, Vulg. *foderunt*; Aquila originally ὤρευσαν, in his second edition 'bound,' and so Symmachus and apparently Jerome, whose original *vinxerunt* (the reading of the Cod. Amiatinus) was corrupted into *finxerunt* and then corrected to *fixerunt*. The Targum has a conflate rendering, 'biting my hands and feet like a lion.'

wrongly divided,¹ and verse 20 should begin, as in the margin, 'Asher, his bread shall be fat.' In Judg. v. 13 the marginal rendering of the words 'as otherwise read,' 'the people of the LORD came down for me against the mighty,' is far preferable to doing violence to grammar, and gives the same contrast between the nobles and the people as in verse 2. In 2 Sam. vi. 5 'With all manner of [instruments made of] fir wood' is a very strange expression, and should be corrected by the parallel passage in 1 Chron. xiii. 8 to 'with all their might, even with songs.' In 2 Sam. ix. 11 there is no warrant for interpolating the words 'said the king.' It would have been far better to follow the reading of the LXX, which makes the words form part of the conclusion of the narrative, thus: 'So Mephibosheth did eat at David's table, as one of the king's sons.' In 2 Sam. xv. 7 'forty' is simply unintelligible, and 'four,' the reading of Josephus, the Syriac, and the Vulgate, should have been placed in the text.

The marginal reading of Ps. xxv. 17,

'The troubles of my heart relieve thou,
And bring me out of my distresses,'

involves only a simple re-arrangement of the words, and should certainly be adopted. In Hos. v. 11 'because he was content to walk after *the command*' gives no satisfactory sense, to say nothing of the difficulty involved in the form of the word and the absence of the article; and the reading 'vanity,' *i.e.* idols, given in the margin from the LXX and Syriac, should change places with the text. In Hos. vi. 5 the reading, 'My judgement goeth forth as the light,' involving simply a different division and punctuation of the same consonants, is surely preferable to 'Thy judgements are as the light that goeth forth.' In Hos. x. 13 the reading 'chariots' for 'way,' found in the LXX, Syriac, and Targum, agrees much better with the context, and should at least have found a place in the margin. In cases such as Gen. xlvii. 31, where the reading of the LXX is quoted in the New Testament (Heb. xi. 21), it would have been well to note it in the margin, though it is certainly not intrinsically preferable to the Hebrew.²

Conjectures, however ingenious, stand on a very different footing from readings attested by ancient Versions; but a few of the most probable might have been admitted to the margin in some obscure passages. Such, for example, is the conjecture

¹ Read the Hebrew עֶקֶב : עֶקֶב instead of מֵאֶשֶׁר : עֶקֶב.

² They read מַטֶּה (matteh), *staff*, for מִטָּה (mittah), *bed*, supplying different vowels in the then unpointed text.

that in Ps. lxxiii. 4 the consonants should be divided and punctuated differently,¹ and rendered—

‘For they have no torments ;
Sound and firm is their strength.’

The reference to the death of the wicked in the Received Text is premature, and the rhythm is much improved by the change.

Failing, however, the admission of conjectural emendations even to the margin, the Revisers might well have recognized more frequently the probability, unwelcome as it is, that the text is corrupt. They have done so in 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, where, indeed, the corruption is beyond question ; but is it not equally certain that 2 Sam. xxi. 19 is also corrupt ? and ought not the ordinary reader to have been saved the futile endeavour to reconcile it with the parallel passage in 1 Chronicles by a simple statement of the fact ?

We have not the slightest desire to cast undeserved discredit upon the Massoretic text, or to exalt the ancient Versions to an undue pre-eminence ; but the fourth rule laid down by the Committee of Convocation for the guidance of the Revisers was ‘That the Text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating,’ and we cannot but think that when internal evidence condemns the Massoretic text, and supports the reading of one or more of the ancient Versions, there is a decided preponderance of evidence in favour of the latter.

We are greatly surprised to see that the American company would prefer to omit from the margin all renderings from the LXX, Vulgate, and other ancient Versions or ‘authorities.’ Were they afraid of unsettling the reader’s mind ? Possibly ; but the candid confession of an uncertainty is in the long run far wiser and safer than an unjustifiable assumption of certainty ; and the admission of uncertainty as regards readings need no more unsettle the reader’s mind than the admission of uncertainty as regards rendering, which must be made again and again.

IV. From Text we pass to Translation ; and here we

¹ Reading *למותם כי אין הרצבות למותם ובריא אולם*. Very ingenious, but less convincing, are such conjectures as *וילך לרשמים*, ‘and he went to enchantments,’ for the obscure ‘and he went to a bare height,’ in Num. xxiii. 3, which only assumes the commonest form of transcriptional error, the omission of recurring letters ; or that in Ps. xxii. 29, *אך לו ישתחוו*, ‘surely to him shall bow down,’ should be read for *אכלו* *וישתחוו*, ‘have eaten and bowed down.’

must remark *in limine* that probably few readers realize the extent of the changes which have been introduced, or appreciate the vast amount of painstaking labour expended on the work. Few are perfectly familiar with the precise words of large portions of the Old Testament, and so smooth and homogeneous is the result, that an actual comparison must be made in order to detect the changes. Startling alterations are not so numerous as some may have expected. It is not often that the sense is so completely changed as in

'I am become an open abhorring'

for

'aforetime I was as a tabret,'¹

or,

'In the thought of him that is at ease there is contempt for misfortune ;

'It is ready for them whose foot slippeth,'

instead of

'He that is ready to slip with his feet is as a lamp despised in the thought of him that is at ease.'²

A bare statement of the number of changes does not convey a very definite idea, and obviously the reckoning may be made in different ways ; but it may be worth while noting the number of changes, great and small, in four books of different character as samples of the whole. Judges may serve as a sample of the historical books ; in it some 830 changes have been made in 618 verses. The First Book of Psalms (i.-xli.) may be taken as a fair specimen of the Psalter ; in it we have noted some 684 changes and 233 marginal notes. Hosea is a prophet of somewhat more than average difficulty ; in it we have reckoned up 335 alterations and 145 marginal notes. Job is the most difficult book in the Old Testament ; we have counted 1389 changes in it, or an average of nearly four changes to every three verses. A precise classification of changes is not possible ; they may obviously be arranged under different heads, and the same change may be regarded from different points of view : but it may give some idea of the general character of the alterations, if we say that of the 684 changes in the First Book of Psalms, two are due to various readings ; 212 may be set down as due to grammatical considerations of construction, tense, preposition, conjunction, article, and

¹ Job xvii. 6.

² Job xii. 5.

the li
and p
tion
archa
plied
Auth
chang
a pas
36 gi
tions,
give
derin
T
quali
here
typic
and s
I.
corre
gate
was u
elón i
no de
right
ment
not p
but p
and
to th
word
Pillar
24, an
in Ge
to id
obelis
with t
M
nacle
'dhel
in th
prope
struct
nacle
1 C
them.'

the like ; 346 concern the more accurate translation of words and phrases ; 51 relate to improvement of English by alteration of expression or order of words, abandonment of archaisms, &c. ; 47 are omissions of words unnecessarily supplied or alterations of words incorrectly supplied in the Authorized Version ; and 26 may be set down as exegetical changes, in which a different view is taken of the meaning of a passage. Of the marginal notes 10 give various readings, 36 give alternative renderings due to grammatical considerations, 112 are alternative renderings of words or phrases, 26 give different interpretations of a passage, 43 are literal renderings, 6 are explanatory.

These are dry and not very significant statistics. The quality of the changes is a matter of far greater moment ; and here the wealth of material is embarrassing. We can but give typical examples in the hope of exciting our readers' interest, and stimulating them to a patient study of the Revisers' work.

1. Many standing errors of the Authorized Version are corrected. Thus the translators of 1611, following the Vulgate and the Jewish authorities (on which latter, as, indeed, was unavoidable at the time, they relied too much), rendered *elôn* in Gen. xii. 6 and other passages by *plain* ; but there is no doubt that *oak*, which is the rendering of the LXX, is rightly adopted by the Revisers. The *groves* so frequently mentioned in connexion with idolatrous worship were certainly not plantations (though this rendering is as old as the LXX), but probably trunks of trees deprived of their branches, and erected as religious symbols. In the uncertainty as to the precise nature of the object denoted, the Hebrew word *Ashêrâh* (plural *Ashêrtm*) has been wisely retained. *Pillars* will be found substituted for *images* in Exod. xxiii. 24, and other passages. The word *Maççêbâh* is rendered *pillar* in Gen. xxviii. 18 and elsewhere, and when used in reference to idolatrous worship denotes the consecrated pillars or obelisks set up as religious symbols, especially in connexion with the worship of Baal.

More important still is the alteration of the familiar *tabernacle of the congregation* to *tent of meeting*. Two words, *'ôhel* and *mishkân*, are indiscriminately rendered *tabernacle* in the Authorized Version. The latter of these two words properly signifies *dwelling-place* ; it is applied to the inner structure of boards and linen curtains, and denotes the Tabernacle as the special dwelling-place of the Lord.¹ This is

¹ Cp. Exod. xxv. 8, where the cognate verb is used for 'dwell among them.'

now uniformly rendered *tabernacle*. The former word, which signifies *tent*, denotes the covering thrown over the tabernacle (Exod. xxvi. 7 ff.); and the whole structure is termed, with reference to its purpose, '*ôhel mō'êd*, or *tent of meeting*, which, as may be inferred from the passages quoted in the margin of Exod. xxvii. 21, denotes the place at which God would meet Moses or the priests or the people, and reveal Himself to them.

The more accurate rendering, *peoples* instead of *people*, noticed by the Revisers in their Preface, and the disuse of the term *heathen* for the Hebrew *gôyim*, 'nations,' except where the word has a distinct moral significance, not only clear up many passages which were before obscure or ambiguous, but have an important bearing on that most interesting question of Old Testament theology, the relation of the chosen people to the nations of the world.

2. The passages in which a strict attention to the laws of grammar has brought out the true meaning or removed difficulties are very numerous. The force of the Hebrew tenses is much better understood now than it was in 1611, and they have been much more correctly rendered. For example, in Exod. xxxiii. 7-11 the tenses denote repeated action, and refer to the habitual practice of Moses during the wanderings. This is expressed by the imperfect, '*Moses used to take the tent and pitch it without the camp.*' The conditional rendering in Exod. ix. 15, 16, '*For now I had put forth my hand, and smitten thee and thy people with pestilence, and thou hadst been cut off from the earth: but in very deed for this cause have I made thee to stand, for to show thee my power, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth,*' is an important correction for the right understanding of God's dealings with Pharaoh. God might have overthrown him by a summary act of chastisement, but instead of so doing He had '*kept him standing,*' that His glory might be more decisively manifested. Equally significant is the distinction drawn between the two words which are used to express the '*hardness*' of Pharaoh's heart: one expressing the idea of obstinate resistance, the other that of stubborn, sullen immobility. And most important of all the changes in this narrative is the correction, '*Pharaoh's heart was hardened*' for '*he hardened Pharaoh's heart,*' in Exod. vii. 13. It will now be seen that God is not said to have '*hardened*' Pharaoh's heart, until he had himself, by repeated acts of resistance to the Divine Will, further '*hardened*' the heart which was already '*hard*' to start with: in other words, that he was not judicially deprived

of t
him

of a
seen
kno
But
tion

'
and
to d

pose
sign

to b

state

came

ange

ident

Sode

with

as th

as Je

3

scure

rende

unint

can r

'I

being

it, the

The

propo

confe

T
and t
rende

1 C
earth
2 C
VOI

of the power of repentance until he had obstinately hardened himself against repentance.

Our next example shall be one of the correct translation of a conjunction. Gen. xviii. 19, in the Authorized Version, seems to be no more than an expression of the Divine foreknowledge of the obedience of Abraham and his descendants. But the conjunction is final, and the right rendering unquestionably is that of the Revised Version :—

‘I have known him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment.’

Knowledge is here equivalent to election ;¹ and the purpose of Abraham’s election is stated, in words of the deepest significance, to be the formation of a holy nation.

A good example of the importance of a definite article is to be found in the same narrative. In place of the indefinite statement in the Authorized Version in ch. xix. 1, ‘there came two angels to Sodom at even,’ we now read ‘*the* two angels came to Sodom at even’ ; and the reader can at once identify them with the ‘men’ who had left Abraham to go to Sodom (xviii. 22), while the third had remained communing with Abraham, being no other than that mysterious Angel who, as the personal representative of Jehovah, is even spoken of as Jehovah Himself (verses 22, 33).

3. The true connexion of important passages is often obscured in the Authorized Version by arbitrary variations in rendering the same word or phrase. Prov. xxix. 24 is almost unintelligible in the Authorized Version, but the rendering

‘Whoso is partner with a thief hateth his own soul :
He heareth the adjuration and uttereth nothing,’

can now be understood as a reference to the law in Lev. v. 1 :

‘If any one sin, in that he heareth the voice of adjuration, he being a witness, whether he hath seen or known, if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity.’

The accomplice who is solemnly adjured by the loser of property² or by the judge, and perjures himself by refusing to confess, destroys his own soul.

The relation between the Servant of the LORD in Isaiah and the suffering Job has often been remarked ; but the correct rendering of Job xvi. 17—

‘Although there is no violence in my hands,’

¹ Cp. Amos iii. 2, ‘You only have I known of all the families of the earth ;’ and Rom. viii. 29, xi. 2.

² Cp. Judg. xvii. 2, *marg.*

must carry the reader's mind irresistibly to the words of Isaiah liii. 9—

'Although he had done no violence.'

Take again the literal rendering of Isa. xlv. 8 :

'Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no Rock, I know not any.'

All the suggestiveness of that great title *Rock*, with its associations of strength, faithfulness, unchangeableness, and all the thoughts developed in relation to it in the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii.), is lost in the Authorized Version by the causeless substitution of *God* for *Rock*.

The fundamental revelation of the attributes of God in Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7 may afford another example of the importance of uniformity in the rendering of the same word, as well as distinction in the rendering of different words. It now runs :—

'The LORD, the LORD, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth ; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.'

In the Authorized Version the words *rahûm* and *hesed* are confounded by the renderings *merciful*, *mercy* ; and the latter word is arbitrarily rendered *goodness* and *mercy* in successive sentences. *Mercy* may not be a wholly adequate rendering of *hesed*, but it is important to have this passage connected with all the others in which mercy and truth are spoken of as the foundation of the dealings of God with man, and consequently of the dealings of man with his fellow-man.

Gen. xxii. 1 may be taken as another instance. We now read that 'God did *prove* Abraham,' and not only is the possible difficulty arising from the use of the word *tempt* removed, but the passage is brought into connexion with a number of others in which God is said to *prove* His people for the trial or confirmation of their faith. Another correction which solves an old objection is the change of *borrow* to *ask* in Exod. iii. 22, xi. 2 ; the difficulty is at once disposed of by the true translation.

4. Much has been done of late years for the investigation of the geography, botany, and zoology of Palestine, and though much must remain uncertain, there are great improvements in the Revised Version. A great advance has been made in the uniform rendering of words denoting specific districts. Take for example the districts mentioned in Deut. i. 7. Instead of the vague *plain* of the Authorized Version

we ha
deep
count
the lo
for th
to G
distr
tween
as in
denot
the I
plan,
adopt
Exod
ally a
A
note
made
with
old E
becom
flagra
gives
and c
ably
const
was p
T
are m
mean
in the
poses
ground
so is a
in que
owls
jackal
howlin
i. 8).
II ; Z
confes
well a
to be
of utte
said t

we have the *Arâbâh* retained as a proper name to denote 'the deep valley running north and south of the Dead Sea'; *hill country* is a good term for the highlands of central Palestine; *the lowland* takes the place of the misleading translation *vale* for the *Shephêlâh* or maritime plain extending from Joppa to Gaza; *South* is spelt with a capital to indicate that a district is meant, the *Negeb* or tract of rolling hills lying between the south of Judah and the actual desert. Where, as in Gen. xxxi. 21, Exod. xxiii. 31, Ps. lxxii. 8, *the River* denotes the Euphrates, which was *the river par excellence* to the Hebrews, it is always spelt with a capital. But some plan, other than a single marginal note, should have been adopted for informing the reader that *river* in Gen. xli. 1 ff., Exod. i. ff., and other passages represents a word *y'dr*, specially applied to the Nile, and of Egyptian origin.

Among changes due to better botanical knowledge we may note the 'vessels of *papyrus*' (Isa. xviii. 2), though Moses's ark, made of the same material, is still called an 'ark of bulrushes' with a marginal note, 'That is, *papyrus*'; *camphire*, the old English for *camphor*, which was unknown to the ancients, becomes *henna*, a plant prized in the East for its clusters of fragrant flowers; *êlâh* is still rendered *oak*, but the margin gives *terebinth*, and this tree, which replaces the oak in warm and dry localities in southern and eastern Palestine, is probably intended; the *shittim-wood* so extensively used in the construction of the Tabernacle is rightly rendered *acacia*, which was probably the only timber available in the desert.

The *badger-skins* used for the covering of the Tabernacle are more correctly described as *seal-skins*, the particular animal meant being probably the *dugong*, a large species of seal found in the Red Sea, the skin of which is still used for similar purposes; *coney* is still retained to denote the hyrax, on the ground that it is now obsolete in its old sense of rabbit, and so is available for the rendering of *shâphân*, though the animal in question belongs to a different family; the *dragons* and *owls* with which Job associates himself (xxx. 29) are now *jackals* and *ostriches*, the former being notorious for their dismal howling, the latter for their weird melancholy cry (cp. Mic. i. 8). The *bittern* has become the *porcupine* (Isa. xiv. 23, xxxiv. 11; Zeph. ii. 14) on etymological grounds; but it must be confessed that this rendering does not suit the passages so well as *bittern*. Some solitude-loving aquatic bird would seem to be intended, whose look and cry would intensify the feeling of utter desolation and ruin: and such is the *bittern*, which is said to haunt reedy swamps, where 'its strange booming

note is as awesome a sound as the wail of the hyæna.' *Wild-ox* rightly replaces the fabulous *unicorn*; evidently a real animal is intended by the Hebrew word *r'êm*, distinguished for its size, strength, untameableness, and magnificent horns, characteristics which were fully satisfied in the now extinct *Bos primigenius*. *Basilisk* takes the place of the fabulous *cockatrice*. In a number of passages *dragon* becomes *jackal*; in others it is changed to *sea-monster*; in others it is retained. The Authorized Version confused two words, *tannîm*, the plural of *tan*, which is now generally understood to mean *jackal*, and *tannîn*, which sometimes is a general term for *sea-monster* (Gen. i. 21), sometimes appears to mean the *crocodile*, and when used metaphorically is still translated *dragon* (e.g. Ps. lxxiv. 13), which perhaps suggests the ideas intended to be conveyed better than a more accurate rendering.

5. The Book of Job seems to us one of the best pieces of the Revisers' work. It is the most difficult book in the Old Testament, and is the worst translated in the Authorized Version. How much uncertainty hangs over the interpretation of many passages may be inferred from the number of alternative renderings in the margin. Many of the changes will startle readers who are not familiar with modern commentaries, but there is no doubt that they give a truer picture of the attitude of the innocent sufferer. Take, for example, his passionate assertion of his own integrity, and his inability to see any principle of rectitude in the Divine government of the world:—

'I am perfect; I regard not myself;
I despise my life.
It is all one; therefore I say,
He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked.
If the scourge slay suddenly,
He will mock at the trial of the innocent.
The earth is given into the hand of the wicked:
He covereth the faces of the judges thereof;
If it be not he, who then is it?' (Job ix. 21-24.)

Or, again, take the boldness with which he traverses the arguments of the Three, that 'the triumphing of the wicked is short,' by a demand to know whether such a statement was really in accordance with actual experience:—

'How oft is it that the lamp of the wicked is put out?
That their calamity cometh upon them?
That God distributeth sorrows in his anger?
That they are as stubble before the wind,
And as chaff that the storm carrieth away?'¹ (xxi. 17, 18.)

¹ The Revisers have been inconsistent in this chapter. If their ren-

21,
wrath
the
his

rend
Vers
as a
play
treas
abso

dering
render

Clearl
tions
unders
should

Few changes are more striking than that in ch. xvi. 20, 21, where Job appeals from God to God, from the God of wrath who is now persecuting him in spite of his innocence, to the God of love whom he had known in the past, to maintain his right with God, and to justify him in the sight of men :—

‘ My friends scorn me :
But mine eye poureth out tears unto God ;
That he would maintain the right of a man with God,
And of a son of man with his neighbour ! ’

Ch. xxviii. 1–11 is an admirable specimen of successful rendering of a very difficult passage. In the Authorized Version it is scarcely intelligible. It now reads consistently as a highly poetical description of the ingenuity of man displayed in mining operations. Man's success in discovering the treasures of the earth is contrasted with his failure to attain to absolute wisdom :—

‘ Surely there is a mine for silver,
And a place for gold which they refine.
Iron is taken out of the earth,
And brass is molten out of the stone.
Man setteth an end to darkness,
And searcheth out to the furthest bound
The stones of thick darkness and of the shadow of death.
He breaketh open a shaft away from where men sojourn ;
They are forgotten of the foot that passeth by ;
They hang afar from men, they swing to and fro.
As for the earth, out of it cometh bread :
And underneath it is turned up as it were by fire.
The stones thereof are the place of sapphires,
And it hath dust of gold.
That path no bird of prey knoweth,
Neither hath the falcon's eye seen it :
The proud beasts have not trodden it,
Nor hath the fierce lion passed thereby.
He putteth forth his hand upon the flinty rock ;
He overturneth the mountains by the roots.
He cutteth out channels among the rocks ;
And his eye seeth every precious thing.

dering of these verses is correct, as we believe it to be, then the marginal rendering of verse 30 must be adopted :—

‘ That the evil man is spared in the day of calamity ;
That they are led away in the day of wrath.’

Clearly he appeals to the experience of travellers to refute the assertions of the Three. But perhaps the questions in verse 30 are to be understood as ironical, and virtually denials. If this is so the English should have been made clearer.

He bindeth the streams that they trickle not ;
 And the thing that is hid bringeth he forth to light.
 But where shall WISDOM be found ?
 And where is the place of understanding ?

But indeed the Revised Version of Job is full of new lights, and we must not yield to the temptation to linger over it.

6. We will conclude this part of our article by a few general examples of improved translation. How striking is the description of the tyranny of sin in Hos. v. 4 : ' Their doings will not suffer them to turn unto their God ' ; or the picture in Job viii. 4, of the sinner being seized and destroyed by the very sin he commits :—

' If thy children have sinned against him,
 And he have delivered them into the hand of their transgression.'

What light is thrown on the mysterious nature of atonement by Lev. xvii. 11 :—

' For the life of the flesh is in the blood : and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls : for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life.'¹

In Hos. vi. 7 we now read a reference to the Fall : ' They like Adam have transgressed the covenant : ' though it must be admitted that neither this rendering nor that of the similar passage in Job xxxi. 33 is absolutely certain.

How forcible is the rendering of Ps. xxix. 9 :—

' In his temple everything saith, Glory.'

And what a gain is the adoption of the K'rî in place of the C'thîb in Ps. c. 3 :—

' Know ye that the LORD he is God :
 It is he that hath made us, and we are his :'

and in Isa. ix. 3 :—

' Thou has multiplied the nation, thou hast increased their joy.'

We might add instance to instance, but we prefer to leave our readers to find them out for themselves. Nor shall we lament over favourite texts and noble expressions which have disappeared. We may still treasure them, so far as they are in accordance with the spirit of Holy Scripture, even though we may not be able to regard them as directly possessing the authority of Scripture.

V. We are grateful to the Revisers for what they have done. They have certainly placed the English reader in a far better

¹ See Dr. Westcott's note on 1 John i. 7, *Epistles of S. John*, p. 34.

position for understanding the Old Testament. But we cannot help feeling that as in regard of Text, so in regard of Translation, they have been wanting in courage. To express every shade of meaning is an impossible task for the translator, even when he can be sure that he exactly understands his original; but without any obnoxious pedantry or literalism or violence to English idiom, the Revisers might again and again have kept closer to the original, to the still greater advantage of the English reader. We proceed to adduce examples.

1. We have seen that the Revisers have introduced great improvements in the rendering of tenses. Why did they not go further? For example, if they had placed the marginal rendering¹ of Gen. ix. 13 in the text, 'I have set my bow in the cloud,' it would be clear that the already existing rainbow was made the token of the covenant, and uninstructed readers would not be left to suppose that it was first created after the Flood. In Gen. xxix. 2, 3, it is by no means evident at first sight that the verbs describe the *habitual* practice of gathering the flocks, and watering them, and not merely a single instance of it. Would 'thither *used* all the flocks to be gathered: and they *would* roll the stone from the well's mouth,' &c., have been too clumsy? In Exod. xxxiv. 33-35, again, the distinction of the tenses is not observed. 'He put a veil on his face,' in verse 33, refers to the action of Moses upon that particular occasion; but the tenses in verses 34, 35 are frequentative, and express his habitual practice upon many subsequent occasions, and should be rendered, 'Whenever Moses went in before the Lord to speak with him, he *used* to take the veil off,' &c. In Ps. vii. 15 we still read that the evil doer 'is fallen into the pit which *he made*': but it should unquestionably have been rendered *he was making*. The Revisers have ignored the Psalmist's forcible picture of destruction overtaking his enemy by means of his own malicious designs while he was still engaged in carrying them out.²

One more example, for it is an important one. Literally rendered, verses 2 and 3 of Isa. vi. would run: 'Seraphim [were] standing above Him; each one had six wings; with twain he covereth his face, and with twain he covereth his feet, and with twain he doth fly. And one crieth unto another, and saith, Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah Sabaoth: the whole earth is full of His glory.' The tense of 'crieth' expresses not merely a single cry, as might still be supposed from the Revised Version, but a continual chorus; as in Rev. iv. 8,

¹ It is the natural rendering of the perfect. Cp. Gen. i. 29.

² See Prof. Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, sec. 27a, note 1.

'They have no rest day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy': or in the words of the Te Deum, 'To Thee Cherubin and Seraphin continually do cry.'

Again, there is a significant use of the present participle in Hebrew, to describe a Divine purpose, which to the eye of man is still future, as already begun. Hence 'if the event designated can only in fact occur after some interval, it asserts forcibly and suggestively the certainty of its approach.'¹ Thus in Gen. vi. 17 the imminence of the Flood is thus forcibly expressed, 'I, behold, I *do bring* the flood of waters upon the earth'; but in Gen. xix. 13 the idiom is obscured by a simple future rendering, 'we will destroy this place,' instead of 'we are destroying,' or 'are about to destroy.' Instances of this loose rendering of the present participle by a future are very common,² and it is a matter for very serious regret that the Revisers have cut off the English reader from this glimpse into the eternal present of the Divine purpose.

2. In the rendering of voices, as well as tenses, the Revisers are somewhat uncertain. Why did they not give the Niphal its full reflexive force in Exod. vi. 3, as they have done in Ps. ix. 16, 'The LORD hath made himself known,' and render, 'By my Name JEHOVAH did I not make myself known to them'?³ Give the Hithpael its full sense in Job xv. 20, and how forcible is the picture, 'The wicked man *tormenteth himself* all his days,' compared with the Revisers' 'travaieth with pain.'⁴ Much as we may wish to retain 'He is just and *having salvation*' in Zech. ix. 9, it is unquestionably a misleading rendering. The Niphal participle, as in Deut. xxxiii. 29, can only mean (as is stated in the margin) 'saved' or 'victorious'; and, indeed, if rightly viewed, the strict rendering increases rather than diminishes the significance of the prophecy.

3. We do not like to accuse the Revisers of a deliberate disregard of grammar, but it seems to us that grammar and context alike demand the marginal rendering in Gen. xv. 1

¹ Prof. Driver's *Tenses*, sec. 135.

² See Gen. xv. 14, lit. 'I am judging'; xvii. 19, 'Sarah is bearing thee a son'; Isa. xliii. 19, 'I am making a new thing.' We do not of course mean that in every case a literal rendering could have been given, but some emphatic turn should have been adopted, e.g. 'Sarah *is to bear* thee a son.'

³ Cp. Ps. xlviii. 3: 'God *hath made himself known* in her palaces for a refuge'; and Is. xix. 21, rightly rendered in the margin: 'The LORD *shall make himself known* to Egypt.'

⁴ תחולל, 'torqueri, de impio heautontimorumenō,' is Gesenius' pithy way of putting it.

instead of that in the text, which requires the interpolation of *and*, and is otherwise doubtful. Abram's question in verse 2, 'What wilt thou give me?' implies that God had said, 'Thy reward shall be exceeding great,' rather than declared that He was Himself his reward. The marginal rendering of Gen. xlix. 4, 'have not thou the excellency,' is the grammatically correct one; and such a denunciation is certainly more forcible than 'thou shalt not have the excellency.'

4. The Revisers frequently omit to express pronouns which are emphatic in the original. In the following passages the pronouns which we have italicized are emphatic, for otherwise they would not be inserted in Hebrew, and the full force of the passage depends upon observing the emphasis: but there is nothing to indicate it to the English reader. 'The child shall be a Nazirite unto God from the womb: and *he* shall begin to save Israel, &c.' (Judg. xiii. 5).¹ 'If *thou* wouldst seek diligently unto God' (Job viii. 5), where Job is contrasted with his children who, says the unfeeling Bildad in verse 4, have probably been destroyed for their sins. 'When *he* giveth quietness, who then can condemn?' (Job xxxiv. 29).² 'For she did not know that *I* gave her the corn' (Hos. ii. 8),³ in contrast to the Baalim. 'For *he* shall roar' (Hos. xi. 10).⁴ We suppose that they were afraid that such a circumlocution as 'it is he who,' or the like, might sound awkward; but the force of the original is impaired.

5. We have spoken already of the importance of uniform rendering for identical words and phrases, and distinct renderings for different words and phrases. We are not concerned to press these principles of assimilation and distinction too rigorously, but it seems to us that the Revisers have applied them in a very half-hearted way. Take, for example, Hos. vi. 4, 6. 'Your *goodness* is as a morning cloud. . . . I desire *mercy*, and not sacrifice.' Is it well that *hesed* should be rendered *goodness* in verse 4, and *mercy* in verse 6, and that the connexion between God's complaint of the transitoriness of Ephraim's *hesed* and His declaration that *hesed* is what he chiefly desires, should be obscured? True, they are connected by the marginal alternative *kindness*: but this is hardly satisfactory. The listener who hears the passage read is none the wiser.

Take, again, the word *hâšîd*. It is a technical designation of the pious in the Old Testament. We have not space here

¹ Vulg. '*Ipse* incipiet liberare Israel.'

² Vulg. '*Ipso* enim concedente pacem quis?' &c.

³ Vulg. 'Nescivit quia *ego* dedi ei frumentum.'

⁴ Vulg. 'Quia *ipse* rugiet.'

to discuss whether it is to be regarded as primarily signifying 'one who is the object of God's *hesed* or loving mercy,' or 'one who is full of *hesed* or piety towards God and men.' The variety of the Revisers' renderings is what we wish to point out. *Saints* is the predominant rendering of the word in the plural, occurring some nineteen times; but we also find *godly* (seven times), with margin 'him whom thou lovest,' and elsewhere 'one that he favoureth'; *holy* (twice), with margin 'godly,' or 'beloved'; *merciful* (twice), and in the two passages where the word is applied to God it is once rendered *merciful* and once *gracious*.

Or take the word *y'shû'âh*. It is rendered 'salvation,' 'help,' 'deliverance,' 'welfare,' 'health,' 'saving health,' 'victory' (*marg.*), and there is much to be said for a variety of rendering in a word of such wide application. But there is no excuse for rendering it 'help' in Ps. iii. 2, and 'salvation' in verse 8 of the same Psalm. The connexion of verses 2, 7, 8 should have been clearly brought out. The mocking taunt of David's enemies is, 'There is no *salvation* for him in his God'; his prayer is 'Save me, O my God'; and the Psalm closes with the triumphant utterance of faith in refutation of his enemies sneers: '*Salvation* belongeth unto the LORD.'

Why should the same verb be rendered in Gen. xxxii. 28 'thou hast *striven* with God'; and in Hos. xii. 3, a clear reference to the narrative of Genesis, 'he *had power* with God': the marginal alternatives 'had power with' being given in Genesis, and 'strove' in Hosea? Why should interesting facts as to the nature of land tenure in ancient Palestine be obscured by such a loose translation as 'the parcel of land' in Ruth iv. 3? It is certainly noteworthy that the same term is applied to Elimelech's allotment as to that of Boaz, in ch. ii. 3, where it is properly rendered 'the portion of the field.'

6. Instances might be largely multiplied, but we pass on to the kindred point—distinction of renderings. The Revisers have very frequently left the same English word to do duty for two or more Hebrew words, where a difference of meaning is clearly involved. Thus *blessed* stands for two quite distinct words; the one (*'ashrêy*) expresses congratulation, as in Ps. i. 1, and should certainly have been rendered *happy*, as in the margin, and in Prov. xxviii. 14, and a number of other passages; the other (*bêrêkh*), when applied to man, specially denotes divine blessing, but in the passive participle is almost exclusively used of God,¹ as in Ps. cxliv. 1, 'Blessed be the LORD my rock.' The confusion is complete in Ps. xli.

¹ See, however, Jer. xvii. 7.

The word in verse 1 is *'ashrêy*, properly meaning 'happy is the man that considereth the poor'; in verse 2 the cognate verb is used; strictly 'he shall be made *happy* on the earth' (surely the margin 'in the land' is preferable); while the word in the doxology in verse 13 is *bārākh*, expressing the tribute of human reverence to the Divine majesty. It is a pity to ignore this distinction, and leave the English reader without the means of drawing the picture of the Old Testament ideal of true happiness.

Again, the verbs *bāṭah* and *hāṣāh* are rendered 'trust' or 'put trust in,' for example, in Ps. xiii. 5 and vii. 1; but the idea of the first is secure confidence, of the second an actual resorting for refuge, as may be seen from Ps. lvii. 1, which is correctly rendered 'In the shadow of Thy wings will I *take refuge*.' The correct rendering is given, it is true, in the margin of Ps. vii. 1, but not in xi. 1, where the rendering

'In the Lord have I *taken refuge* :
How say ye to my soul,
Flee as a bird to your mountain ?'

is distinctly required to point the contrast between David's divine refuge and the material refuge to which taunting enemies or disheartened friends bid him flee. The Old Testament words expressing confidence are too significant for it to be right to ignore the shades of meaning they convey.

One more example of archæological, not doctrinal, interest. In Judg. ix. 2, ff., the word rendered '*men* of Shechem' means literally *masters* or *lords*. The same word is used of the '*men*' of Jericho (Josh. xxiv. 11), Gibeah (Judg. xx. 5), Keilah (1 Sam. xxiii. 11), Jabesh (2 Sam. xxi. 12). Whether all the citizens are meant, or only a select governing body, need not be discussed here; in 1 Sam. xxiii. the '*masters*' of Keilah (verse 11) are distinguished from the '*inhabitants*' (verse 5); but the use of the special term should have been recognized at least in the margin.

7. We must pass on to a question of paramount importance for the study of the Biblical theology of the Old Testament—the rendering and representation of the Names of GOD. There are three words for God in Hebrew: *Elôhîm*, *Elôah*, and *El*. The first is the general term; the second, which is the singular of the first, is principally found in the Book of Job and other poetical or late writings; the third, which means *the Strong*, is, according to Oehler, the oldest Semitic name of God. It is used in the titles *El Shaddai*, 'God Almighty,' and *El 'Elyôn*, 'God Most High,' and is specially character-

istic of the patriarchal age. In later times it is principally used in poetry (Job, Psalms), though not uncommon in the Prophets, especially Isaiah. It never appears in the historical books from Judges to Esther (except in poetical passages in Samuel, and phrases quoted from Deuteronomy in Nehemiah¹), nor in Proverbs. No attempt has been made systematically to distinguish these names; occasionally when they occur together they are transliterated, as in Gen. xxxiii. 20, where we read that Jacob called his altar *El-elohe-Israel*; or Josh. xxii. 22, where a marginal note records the fact that the Hebrew of the words 'The LORD, the God of gods,' is *El Elohim Jehovah*.² But the distinction is of importance, sometimes in regard to the steps of the patriarchal revelation, sometimes in regard to the fundamental meaning of *El*. For example, God's words to Jacob in Gen. xlv. 3 gain point if we know that 'I am God, the God of thy father,' is properly 'I am *El*, the God of thy father,' and remember that *El* is the special Name of the patriarchal revelation. And in such passages as Job ix. 2, 'How can man be just with God,' the contrast is heightened if the reader knows that the words for *man* and *God* are *'enôsh* and *El*, the one denoting man in his weakness, the other God in His strength. If the English language is too poor to afford a distinctive rendering, a marginal note might have been given wherever *God* represents *El*.

More important still is the question of the proper treatment of the great Name of Old Testament revelation, which we are accustomed to pronounce *Jehovah*. It is well known that from early times, probably soon after the return from the captivity, the Jews, from motives of reverence degenerating into superstition, refused to pronounce the Name, and substituted for it *Adônai*, *i.e.* *Lord*—or, where it occurred in combination with *Adônai*, *Elôhim*, *i.e.* *God*. This practice was continued in the English Versions, and with few exceptions *LORD* or *GOD* is substituted for the Sacred Name, these words, however, being printed in small capitals whenever they are so used. The Revisers have followed the usage of the Authorized Version, departing from it only 'in a few passages in which the introduction of a proper name seemed to be required.' They were probably influenced by two motives: the desire to retain the connexion with the New Testament, which is established by the use of *LORD*, and the feeling that *JEHOVAH* is not the true pronunciation of the Name. For it is all but universally admitted on philological grounds that

¹ 1 Sam. ii. 3; 2 Sam. xxii. 31, 32, 33, 48; xxiii. 5; Neh. i. 5; ix. 31, 32.

² Cp. Ps. l. 1.

the pronunciation JEHOVAH¹ is a combination of the consonants of the Name with the vowels of Adônai which are attached to them in the Hebrew text, and that the true pronunciation is *Yahveh* [Yahweh].

The American Revisers would have introduced *Jehovah* throughout. This, for the first of the reasons stated above, would have been unadvisable. But it will be matter for serious regret to many that our own company did not introduce it somewhat more freely. The second reason suggested for its non-introduction does not appear to be of overwhelming weight. The really important point is to lead the reader to feel that it is a proper name of primary significance in the history of Revelation. But even the instructed reader can hardly help associating the ideas of sovereignty and power with LORD, instead of remembering that it represents God as the Self-revealing Being, Who is continually manifesting His character to His people.² A slight help is given by the change of such phrases as 'the LORD God of Israel' into 'the LORD, the God of Israel': but it is hardly sufficient. In all the passages where stress is laid on the Name of Jehovah, or where an appeal is made to the revelation contained in that Name, its introduction would, we think, have been a real help towards the true understanding of the meaning. Let Exod. iii. 14-16 be read, with the substitution of JEHOVAH for LORD:

'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, JEHOVAH, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.'

The force of this important passage, taken in connexion with ch. vi., where the name JEHOVAH is introduced, is, we venture to think, made much clearer thereby. This is true also of such passages as Exod. xv. 3: 'The LORD is a man of war: the LORD is his name'; Isa. xlii. 8: 'I am the LORD: that is my name'; Hos. xii. 5: 'The LORD, the God of hosts; the LORD is his memorial'; Mal. iii. 6: 'I the LORD change not.' In these, and many other passages, the full meaning is not realized, until all that the Name implied to Israel is taken into account; and it is not easy to associate

¹ It is mediæval and not ancient. The first trace of it is said to be in Martini's *Pugio fidei*, and Galatinus, a friend of Reuchlin, brought it into currency, since 1518. See Oehler's *Old Test. Theology*, E. Transl. i. 138.

² See Oehler, i. 134 ff.

these ideas with the word LORD. The Jewish reader, though he may not pronounce the ineffable NAME, yet has the sacred letters of the Tetragrammaton before his eyes. The question, however, is one of no small delicacy and difficulty, and we are aware that the decision of the Revisers will be very widely approved, and that by many whose judgment deserves the highest respect.¹

8. Space forbids us to enter into detail as regards the Revisers' dealing with the Hebrew words for *man*. It cannot be pronounced altogether satisfactory. We have already referred to Job ix. 2, where man in his weakness (*enôsh*) is contrasted with God in His strength. It is surprising that the Revisers did not adopt the rendering *mortal man*, which they had before them in the Authorized Version of ch. iv. 17. *Geber*, on the other hand, denotes man in his strength. It may not always be specially significant, but it certainly is in Job xxii. 2: 'Can a man be profitable unto God?' the original conveys the idea of *man at his best*. And why, we cannot but ask, was the expressive phrase 'all human flesh'² ignored in Job xii. 10, and so weakly rendered 'all mankind'?

9. It is a matter of extreme surprise to us that *Belial* has survived in the historical books. It cannot be seriously maintained to be a proper name, and probably most readers explain it by the help of Milton, and associate with the term 'sons of Belial' the idea of specially malicious wickedness, rather than worthlessness. The American Revisers are certainly right in translating it (as our Revisers do except in the historical books), though *base* is not perhaps the best equivalent.

The inconsistency of retaining the word *Sheol* in the poetical books, and translating it in the historical books, is another matter for regret. *Sheol* should have been adopted throughout. Its very strangeness would excite wholesome inquiry, and meaning would soon gather round the word. But as it is, its introduction gives an opportunity for calling attention to the dimness of Old Testament knowledge respecting a future life, and for correcting popular errors with regard to the intermediate state. 'Hell,' however, should certainly have been banished even from Isa. xiv.

It is very questionable whether *Satan* should have been

¹ Very important, too, is Deut. vi. 4. The Name is much wanted and the second of the three marginal alternatives appears to us to be the right rendering: 'The LORD is our God, the LORD is one.' There are two assertions: (1) that Jehovah is Israel's God; (2) that He is ONE.

² Cp. Ps. lxxviii. 39.

retain
It is
in ev
assoc
entir
repr
as a
from
of m
poten
nism
side
tion.
marg
I
marg
prefe
which
equal
Josep
tunic
subst
Why
of the
ward
'thith
was a
ironic
lamb
certain
chap.
ranso
and I
'O de
struct
by the
from
'And

¹ It
it coul
that th
sâtan—
son's C
p. 7. C
² C

retained in Job i., ii.; Zech. iii. 1, 2; 1 Chron. xxi. 1. It is by no means clear that it is a proper name; at any rate, in every case except the last, it has the definite article, and associations have gathered round the name Satan which are entirely foreign to the conception of 'the Adversary' as he is represented in the Old Testament. In no case does he appear as a fallen angel, the head of the powers of evil, estranged from and in deliberate opposition to God. He is the adversary of man, and of God's purposes of mercy to man, and thus is in potential antagonism to God; but the nature of this antagonism is only fully developed in the New Testament, side by side with the fuller revelation of God's purposes of Redemption. It would certainly have been safer to render, as in the margin, 'the Adversary.'¹

10. There are a considerable number of cases in which the marginal renderings will commend themselves to scholars in preference to those of the text, and some alternative renderings which are not recognized seem to deserve a place in the margin equally with many which are found there. For example, Joseph's 'coat of many colours' was more probably 'a sleeved tunic' or 'long garment with sleeves.' Why is not 'bitumen' substituted for the unmeaning 'slime' in Gen. xi. 3, Exod. ii. 3? Why should the magnificent 'Who treadeth upon the high places of the sea' (Job ix. 8)? be lost? If the Hebrew means 'hitherward' in Jer. l. 5, what right have translators to substitute 'thitherward,' and obscure the natural inference that the writer was at Jerusalem? Ewald's rendering of Hos. iv. 16 as an ironical exclamation, 'Should the LORD now feed them as a lamb in a wide place!' i.e. give Israel protection and prosperity, certainly deserves consideration; as does the interpretation of chap. xiii. 14 as a threat: 'From the power of Sheol should I ransom them? from death should I redeem them?' Sheol and Death being then summoned as the agents of destruction, 'O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?' and the irrevocable nature of the doom pronounced by the closing words of the verse, 'repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.' The marginal rendering of Hos. xi. 12, 'And Judah is yet *unstedfast* with God, and with the Holy

¹ If the word *Satan* had conveyed anything of its present associations it could not have been used as it is in Num. xxii. 22, 23, where it is said that the angel of the LORD stood in the way to be an adversary—Heb. *sātān*—to Balaam. There is a good note on the subject in Prof. Davidson's *Commentary on Job* in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, p. 7. Cp. also Oehler's *O. T. Theology*, § 200.

² Cp. Amos iv. 13: 'That treadeth upon the high places of the earth.'

One who is faithful,' is required by the context, as well as more consistent with philology.¹

VI. Many such instances might be collected; but we must pass on to consider the Revisers' treatment of a few passages which, either from their intrinsic importance or from popular associations, are likely to be regarded with special interest.

1. The first we shall take is Gen. xlix. 10. The Revisers render

'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
Nor the ruler's staff from between his feet,
Until Shiloh come;
And unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be.'

The second line, as now rendered, presents the picture of a king sitting on his throne, with his staff, the emblem of royal dignity, planted between his feet, in the way which is depicted on Assyrian monuments. Royalty is promised to Judah, until——. Here is the *crux* of the prophecy. The words as pointed in our present Hebrew text admit of two renderings: (1) 'until Shiloh come,' or (2), as in the margin, 'until he come to Shiloh.' According to the first of these renderings Shiloh is regarded as a name of the Messiah. Such a name would naturally be significant, and it is commonly interpreted to mean 'Peaceable'; but to this explanation there are grave philological objections. The form of the word precludes derivation from the root *shâlâh*; and even apart from the question of form, the root denotes rest and ease, not peace. But setting aside philological difficulties, antiquity knew nothing of this title. There is no trace of it in the Old or New Testament, and the earliest reference to it is in a passage in the Talmud, which cannot be regarded as serious interpretation, or as evidence that the name Shiloh was then generally accepted as a title of Messiah. The second rendering has in its favour the fact that everywhere else in the Old Testament Shiloh denotes the place of that name. It is adopted by such an orthodox scholar as Delitzsch, and is unquestionably grammatically possible. But no thoroughly satisfactory interpretation of it can be offered.

Two other marginal renderings are given: (3) that of the LXX, 'until that which is his shall come';² and (4) that of the Syriac, 'till he come whose it is,' with which substantially agrees the variant reading of the LXX given below. The Targum

¹ See the Revisers' renderings of the same word *יָחִיד* in Gen. xxvii. 40, Jer. ii. 31.

² ἕως ἐν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ. Another reading is ὃ ἀποκείται. Compare No. 4.

of Onkelos and the Jerusalem Targum paraphrase 'until Messiah come, whose is the kingdom.' All these renderings are based upon a different vocalization of the consonants SHLH; ¹ they do not regard the word as a proper name. It is possible that there is a reference to this mode of reading the word in Ezek. xxi. 25-27:

'Thou, . . . the prince of Israel, whose day is come, . . . thus saith the Lord God: Remove the mitre, and take off the crown: this shall be no more the same: exalt that which is low, and abase that which is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: this also shall be no more, *until he come whose right it is*; and I will give it him.'

Be that as it may, these ancient renderings of the passage, although they know nothing of a Messianic title Shiloh, agree in giving a sense to the passage which is really Messianic, and to which the proper name would add little or nothing. They assign a royal supremacy to Judah, until his kingdom is merged in one greater and more glorious. Whatever may be the true interpretation of the passage, the Revisers could not leave the rendering of the Authorized Version without a recognition in the margin that another rendering of the words is equally possible, and that none of the ancient Versions support the existing reading.²

2. We pass on to Ps. ii. 12. The Revisers retain the rendering 'Kiss the son,' but add in the margin '*Some ancient versions render, Lay hold of (or, Receive) instruction; others, Worship in purity.*' The first is the rendering of the LXX, Vulgate, and Targum; the second that of Aquila (nearly), Symmachus, and Jerome.³ The Syriac is the only ancient Version which renders 'Kiss the son,' if indeed that is its original reading. The passage is, in fact, one of ex-

¹ שִׁלָּה was read, not שִׁילָה, and punctuated שִׁלָּה, equivalent to אֶחָד לוֹ. The Vulgate rendering *qui mittendus est* depends on a change of reading to שִׁלָּה.

² There is an admirable essay on the history of the interpretation of this passage by Professor Driver in the *Journal of Philology* for 1885, No. 27, pp. 1 ff. Dr. Cheyne's Essay 'On the Royal Messiah in Genesis' should also be consulted. It is to be found in vol. ii. of the first and second editions of his *Isaiah*, but is omitted in the third. He proposes a correction of the text, but substantially follows the LXX.

³ But in his commentary he rendered the words *adorate filium*, and when charged with inconsistency, answered in words which advocates of doubtful renderings in the supposed interests of orthodoxy would do well to ponder: 'Quid igitur peccavi si verbum ambiguum diversa interpretatione converti? et qui in commentariolis ubi libertas est disserendi dixeram *adorate filium*, in ipso corpore ne violentus viderer interpres et Judaicae calumniae locum darem dixerim *adorate pure sive electe*; quod Aquila quoque et Symmachus transtulerunt.'—*Adv. Ruffin.*

treme obscurity. The difficulty in the way of rendering 'Kiss the son' is not so much that the verb rendered 'kiss' has not its usual government, or that the word for 'son' has no article, but that this word is not the Hebrew *ben*, as in verse 7, but the Aramaic *bar*. It is true that *bar* is found in Prov. xxxi. 2, but this passage, though Hebrew, contains other Aramaic forms; and *bar* in the sense of *son* occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament except in the Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel. The use of a foreign word in place of that commonly current is hardly explicable on the ground of euphony, as some suggest, and the rendering of the passage cannot possibly be positively determined. The margin therefore expresses a legitimate doubt. But a wholly unwarranted importance is sometimes assigned to this verse, as if the Messianic reference of the Psalm stood or fell with it. If the verse were omitted altogether, that reference would remain unaltered.

3. The marginal alternative *pit* for *corruption* in Ps. xvi. 10 is again only the expression of a legitimate doubt. The rendering of the LXX is *διαφθοράν*, and this is quoted by S. Peter in Acts ii. 27, and by S. Paul in Acts xiii. 35; but their use of the Septuagint Version does not prove it to be correct in this, any more than in rendering the word for 'I have set' by 'I beheld.' The word *shakhath* may mean corruption, here and in some other passages, but in others¹ it *must* mean 'pit,' and that *may* be its proper sense here.

4. Readers who have been accustomed to regard Jer. xxiii. 6 as a proof text for the Deity of Christ, as though the promised king were Himself called Jehovah, may be disappointed to find the rendering changed to 'The LORD is our righteousness'; but the comparison of similar names, and the fact that the Jerusalem of the future is to bear the same title (ch. xxxiii. 16), prove that this rendering is strictly correct. The promise which it contains is that in and through the Messiah Jehovah will manifest Himself to work out righteousness in His people; and that in and through His Church righteousness will be yet further spread abroad and established in the world.

5. The rendering in Dan. iii. 25, 'The aspect of the fourth is like a son of the gods' in place of 'the form of the fourth is like the Son of God,' and that in Dan. vii. 13, 'there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man' instead of 'one like the Son of man,' may also be disappointing, but they are demanded by sound philology. The insertion of

¹ E.g. Job ix. 31; xxxiii. 24, 28; Ps. xxxv. 7; xciv. 13; Prov. xxvi. 27.

the definite article is not justifiable in either case. Indeed, in the first passage the Authorized Version puts too much into Nebuchadnezzar's mouth. He saw a sublime Divine form, which we may, but he could not, identify; and the point of the second passage is the *human* form of Him who appeared, as distinguished from the beasts which had preceded. The Messianic prophecy contained in the passage is not weakened; but the origin of the title 'the Son of Man,' which He has taught us to give Him, must not be sought here.

6. It may be a surprise to some that the title 'Messiah' disappears from Dan. ix. 25, 26. Its retention in the margin fairly expresses the state of the case, that though it is not impossible to regard it as a proper name here, the balance of probability is decidedly on the other side. It was not until after the close of the Old Testament Canon that *māshiah*, 'anointed,' came to be regarded as the special title of Him to whom the hopes of the people were directed.

7. Pages might be spent in discussing the famous passage in Job xix. 25-27. It is to be feared that the rendering 'redeemer' will still lead the English reader to read thoughts into the passage which it does not, at least in its original connexion, really contain. The word here means 'champion' or 'vindicator,' and Job's confidence is that God will ultimately vindicate his rights and manifest his innocence. But does the passage express a belief in the Resurrection of the body? The Revised Version, 'from my flesh shall I see God,' seems to imply that it does. So far as the Hebrew is concerned, the sense is uncertain. 'From my flesh' may mean 'looking from my flesh,' *i.e.* as in the Authorised Version, 'in my flesh'; or, 'away from my flesh,' *i.e.* as in the Revised Version margin, which the American Revisers would prefer, 'without my flesh.' The general scope and context of the passage must decide: and, especially considering the vagueness of Old Testament revelation with regard to a resurrection, the latter is probably the correct way of taking the passage. The words do not express under what conditions, but after what events, Job will see God—namely, after his body has been destroyed by the ravages of disease. His soul faints within him, not at the prospect of being restored to the body after death, but at the overwhelming thought that some day he will see God, loving and reconciled. The Christian belief in the Resurrection of the body is not shaken by this interpretation. It rests upon the solid fact of our Lord's Resurrection.

Here we must pause. There can be no doubt that a most valuable work is offered to readers of the Bible in the Revised

Old Testament. We have ventured to criticize, and to express the opinion that all has not been done which might have been done, and that in regard of both Text and Translation the Revisers have been somewhat timid, because we think it is right that English readers should recognize what the Revised Version is not, as well as what it is. But this very caution will probably commend it to the public, and they may rest assured that the changes introduced are, with rare exceptions, well substantiated.

If the largely increased number of alternative renderings in the margin should seem to some readers perplexing, as tending to cast unreasonable doubts upon the meaning of Holy Scripture, we would ask them to ponder the weighty words of the Translators of 1611 :—¹

'Some peradventure would have no variety of senses to be set in the margin, lest the authority of the Scriptures for deciding of controversies by that show of uncertainty should somewhat be shaken. But we hold their judgment not to be so sound in this point.'

Some of the causes of obscurities in Scripture, and the reasons for them, having been discussed, the Preface continues :—

'Now in such a case doth not a margin do well to admonish the reader to seek further, and not to conclude or dogmatize upon this or that peremptorily? For as it is a fault of incredulity to doubt of those things that are evident; so to determine of such things as the Spirit of God hath left (even in the judgment of the judicious) questionable, can be no less than presumption. Therefore, as S. Augustine saith, that variety of translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures: so diversity of signification and sense in the margin, where the text is not so clear, must needs do good—yea, is necessary, as we are persuaded.'

And here we cannot refrain from observing that the study of the Revised Version makes us feel even more strongly than we did before the importance of laying greater stress on Hebrew in the training of candidates for Holy Orders. The fact of these variations makes it more than ever desirable that clergymen should be qualified, if not to form an independent opinion, at least to weigh the arguments, in the case of disputed renderings. And the feeling how far short even this greatly improved translation comes, again and again, of expressing the full sense of the original, makes us wish most earnestly that this original should be more widely studied by

¹ In *The Translators to the Reader*. The whole passage should be read.

thos
peo

and

Test

cons

nex

mis

Test

else

phra

to d

in it

not

used

latio

we n

a be

of th

ever

of th

the l

in th

contr

illum

that,

are l

all in

The M

a

T

We n

Octob

volum

pletes

which

with a

and di

In

during

derous

those who should be the expounders of the Bible to the people.

We trust that the Revised Version will supply a stimulus and incentive to the patient and thorough study of the Old Testament; that the necessity which it imposes on every conscientious student of reconsidering the meaning and connexion of many familiar texts will strike a heavy blow at the misquotation and misapplication of passages from the Old Testament which are still far too common in the pulpit and elsewhere; that, if changes in detail and the loss of familiar phrases seem for the moment discouraging, the result may be to direct the student to dwell more upon the Old Testament in its entirety; to treat each book as an organic whole, and not as an aggregation of texts which can be picked out and used regardless of context; and to investigate the mutual relations of the different volumes in the 'Divine Library,' which, we may be sure, have not been chosen and arranged without a beneficent purpose for man's instruction. The great lessons of the Divine government of the world, of the Living God ever working in the world through men and in spite of men, of the slow yet certain evolution of the Divine purpose through the long ages, are not unneeded now. We see how all things in that Old Dispensation, in spite of every appearance to the contrary, were leading up to CHRIST; and the reflected light illuminates much that is dark now, and confirms our confidence that, in spite of every appearance to the contrary, all things are leading up to that final consummation when GOD shall be all in all.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Massorah. Compiled from MSS. Alphabetically and Lexically arranged by CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D. Vol. II. Caph-Thav. (London, 1883.)

WE noticed the first volume of this great work in our number for October 1881. The long delay in the appearance of the second volume was caused by a strike of the printers at Vienna. It completes the text of the critical *corpus*, and will be followed by a third, which is now in the press, containing translations of all the rubrics, with a description of the MSS. used by the author, explanatory notes, and dissertations.

In the preface Dr. Ginsburg has given an account of his labours during more than a quarter of a century in compiling these ponderous folios, and it must be admitted that they could only have

been brought to a successful issue under the influence of a strong enthusiasm. After he had conceived the idea of reconstructing the Massorah on a new principle, he found that the undertaking could not be carried out successfully without compiling certain preliminary works, because the helps required were not to be found in any existing treatise. The Massorah contains lists of the passages in Scripture where certain proper names occur in unusual order, as Aaron before Moses, Jacob before Israel; but, as there were no means available by which it could be ascertained whether any cases had not been omitted by the critics, it became necessary for him to construct a Hebrew concordance of such terms, which grew in his hands to the size of a folio volume of 450 pages. Dealing with the particles entailed still greater difficulty, because the Massorah contains lists of those which begin verses, or occur so many times in a verse, and of the places where two or more are combined. As there was no way of controlling this branch of the work, a new concordance of Hebrew particles was required, which became two folio volumes of 500 pages each. The Massorah also catalogues the words beginning with a certain letter which follow the particles, as well as the particles which are in a unique manner combined with certain words, as when the passages are specified in which words beginning with *Shin* follow so many times the Hebrew particle *upon*, and when the particle which represents the sign of the accusative is followed twice by the proper name Eleazar, and when the same particle with the conjunctive is also followed twice by the same proper name. These and hundreds of other similar combinations could not be verified until after a third concordance, dealing exclusively with the particles, had been compiled, which became another folio volume of 250 pages. Lists, found often in a fragmentary state, of verbs, nouns, particles, and proper names which respectively occur only once in a certain form, appear alphabetically and otherwise arranged in every MS. of the Hebrew Bible to which a Massorah is attached. To test these lists accurately by the existing concordances was soon discovered to be impossible. Besides, the margins of MSS. frequently contain groups of expressions beginning with the same letter, which were not always legible. In order to rectify deficiencies, a list of such terms has been printed at the beginning of every letter in the alphabetical arrangement, so that the accuracy of the statements of the Massoretes can be tested, and whatever seems to be wanting in MSS. can be supplied. The Massorah also contains long alphabetical lists of words which *end* with a certain letter. In order to test the accuracy of them, he found it necessary to compile a fifth concordance, which has been broken up and arranged under each letter in the lexical arrangement. This list and the former exhibit upwards of 40,000 expressions or forms of expression which occur only once in the Hebrew Bible.

From the days of Ben Chayim, who edited for Bomberg the great Rabbinic Bible, with the *apparatus criticus* attached in the margin and at the end, nothing, beyond attempts to correct mistakes, had been done by scholars either to bring to light new MSS. or to widen

the fi
the M
tary
Mass
accou
was i
the a
the t
This
a tran
conta
their
whate
the M
proleg
polyg
mista
been
sorah
The l
of the
Naph
be se
proleg
what
into t
the er
them,
An
taking
const
tions
and fi
by Bo
to the
indee
that i
propo
fully c
An au
intend
search
could
exami
less, l
hither
for a n
and th
Rabbi
form,

the field of inquiry. The labours of the elder Buxtorf were based on the Massorah as it existed in his day, and were limited to commentary and explanation, as appears from his *Tiberias, sive Commentarius Massorethicus*, of which the first part was devoted to an historical account of the Massoretes of Tiberias and their labours, the second was intended to be a key to the Massorah, providing explanations of the abbreviations, mnemonical signs, and terms used by them, and the third was an attempt to correct some of the errors found in it. This treatise and the *Massoreth Hamassoreth* of Elias Levita, of which a translation into English was published by Dr. Ginsburg in 1866, contained all the information upon which subsequent scholars based their discussions. In England Massoretic studies made no progress whatever, perhaps owing to the popular notion that the labours of the Massoretes were little better than laborious trifling. The eighth *prolegomenon*, 'De Masora Keri et Kethiv,' prefixed to Walton's polyglot, was taken almost entirely from Levita and Buxtorf, with the mistakes made by them, of which the author does not seem to have been aware, and proves how limited was the knowledge of the Massorah possessed by Anglican scholars during the seventeenth century. The lists of the *Kethiv* and *Keri*, and of the *Haluphim* or variations of the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews, and of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, printed in the last volume, are also very imperfect, as may be seen by comparing them with the new Massorah. Lee in the *prolegomena* to his Polyglot did not produce any information beyond what was already known, and did not attempt to introduce corrections into the sacred text even where they were obviously required. At the end he published the *Kethiv* and *Keri* as far as he was aware of them, with the notes of the Massoretes attached.

After he had completed his preliminary labours, Dr. Ginsburg, taking up the work where Ben Chayim had left it, proceeded to reconstruct the Massorah from MSS. and arrange the critical observations in lexical order, discarding the old arrangement of *marginalis* and *finalis*. The latter worked from *codices* which had been collected by Bomberg for his use, but no account of them is given in his Preface to the Rabbinic Bible, or of the places where they were found, or, indeed, any information whatever, except that they were full of errors, that in some cases they were unintelligible, and that in others the proper arrangement had been lost. This description was afterwards fully confirmed by Levita as the result of independent investigations. An author in the present day must find his own materials, and, as he intended to do the work thoroughly, Dr. Ginsburg set out in the search for MSS. in every library in Europe and Asia where any tidings could be heard of them. Where Ben Chayim consulted ten he has examined a hundred, like him rejecting whatever seemed to be worthless, but now for the first time bringing to light much that has hitherto not been known to scholars, and providing ample materials for a revision of the text of the Old Testament. The critical acumen and the vast knowledge of Hebrew and kindred languages and of Rabbinic literature employed in reducing the Massorah to its present form, will only be fully understood as time advances. The strong

prejudice against it which has long prevailed, arising from the labours of the Massorites in their character of *Sopherim*, or numberers, in counting the verses, words, and letters of the sacred text, with no apparent useful results, will to some extent be removed when the rubrics shall have become known in an English dress, showing the objects aimed at and the gain which has accrued. For the present it may be sufficient to say that the variations in numerous places between the Septuagint and the Hebrew MSS. afforded them sufficient justification for counting the words of every book, with the view of so fixing each in its place as to prevent the possibility of the text being corrupted. Owing to their limited knowledge of the Massorah, scholars have devoted themselves principally to the examination of the *Kethiv* and *Keri* and the *Haluphim*, but these in reality include only a small portion of it, and, however important in themselves, only suggest a very inadequate idea of the labours of the Massorettes. The most important part of Walton's *prolegomenon* has been devoted to the literature of the former, which since his time has been greatly increased by the labours of Dr. Ginsburg, who has succeeded in dissipating many hallucinations about the way in which they arose, and about the recondite meanings which the Rabbis imagined were contained in some of them.

The Massorah, as now reconstructed, contains a greatly enlarged list of the *Kethiv* and *Keri*, showing that the classification of them as proposed by Levita, and afterwards in a different form by Dr. Ginsburg himself, must be modified. The variations between the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews have been embodied with them in one place, and given separately in another, and the lists show that they also are more numerous than has hitherto been supposed, that the notion that they are merely orthographical is erroneous, because some are radical and affect the meaning, and that the assertion of Walton and others that none of them are found in the Pentateuch cannot be sustained, as anyone can ascertain for himself by referring to the text. In like manner the variations between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, which Levita said were limited to the punctuation and accentuation, include also differences in the structure of terms which in some few instances alter the sense. He is a great authority on Massoretic subjects, and his error on this and other matters must be explained by remembering that his views were based on the Massorah as settled by Ben Chayim, which is much more limited than the results which Dr. Ginsburg has now achieved.

The *Haluphei karya*, various readings, must be distinguished from the *Kethiv* and *Keri*. They consist of different forms of expression with substantially the same meaning, occurring in the same book and in different books, the differences appearing both in the terms and in the punctuation. In Kings and Chronicles these variations affect the sense more than in the other books of Scripture. The lengthy list which has now been printed in a complete form contains many examples where, although the general meaning in each is for the most part the same, there are differences caused either by amplification or alteration, which the efforts of critics have hitherto failed to reconcile.

T
chs.
v., v.
phim
had f
beco
At 1
porch
pillar
from
Hebr
traffi
people
beside
of Ar
Solom
with
T
xx. an
betwe
given
is a s
in th
comm
in the
C
with
the f
the P
which
logy,
divide
section
was d
the Sa
called
becau
into v
Priest
remain
up in
from
read
called
synag
but if
follow
spond
lxi. re
New

The variations which affect the sense are very numerous, 1 Kings chs. v., vii., viii., ix., x., and xii., as compared with 2 Chron. chs. iii., iv., v., vi., vii., and viii., affording many illustrations of this class of *Haluphim*. At 1 Kings iv. 26 (v. 6 in the Heb.) the reading and Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses and for his chariot (*chariots*, E.V.) becomes in 2 Chron. ix. 25 *four thousand stalls for horses and chariots*. At 1 Kings vii. 21 the reading, and he set up pillars in (at, R.V.) the porch of the temple becomes in 2 Chron. iii. 17 and he reared up the pillars before the temple. At 1 Kings x. 15 there are three variations from 2 Chron. ix. 14. In the former passage the rendering of the Hebrew is, *besides that (the gold) he had of the merchantmen, and of the traffic of the spice merchants, and of all the kings of Arabia (the mingled people, R.V.), and of the governors of the country, and in the latter besides that which merchantmen and traders brought; and all the kings of Arabia and the governors of the country brought gold and silver to Solomon*. In the former passage the Hebrew term for Arabia is pointed with two *Segols*, and in the latter with *Chateph patach* and *Kamets*.

The variations between 2 Sam. chs. xxi. and xxiv. and 1 Chron. chs. xx. and xxi. extend also to a considerable number. The difference between the muster rolls of the fighting men in Israel and Judah, as given in 2 Sam. xxiv. 19 and 1 Chron. xxi. 5 is duly noted. There is a slight variation, not affecting the general meaning, between v. 19 in the former chapter, *according to the saying of Gad, as the Lord commanded*, and v. 19 in the latter, *at the word of Gad, which he spake in the name of the Lord*, which is pointed out in this list.

Complete lists of the *Parshioth* and *Haphtaroth* are provided, with the mnemonical terms for each. The Massorah shows that of the former there were two arrangements, one being the division of the Pentateuch into fifty-four sections to cover the fifty-four Sabbaths which might occur in any one year according to the Jewish chronology, and the other the triennial cycle, according to which it was divided into one hundred and fifty-three or one hundred and fifty-five sections, so as to be read through in three years. Every *Parashah* was divided into seven subsections, of which each had a name. In the Sabbatic section, *Shemoth* (Ex. i.-vi. 1), the third subsection is called *S'neh* (the bush), which explains the reference in S. Luke xx. 37, because in the time of our Saviour the Pentateuch was not divided into verses. The first subsection was read in the synagogue by a Priest, the second by a Levite, and the third by an Israelite, and the remaining four by other members of the congregation, who were called up indiscriminately by the Ruler. The *Haphtaroth* were selections from the prophets corresponding to the Sabbatic lessons. They were read at the same service by one person only, who in like manner was called up for this duty. It has been supposed that the Saviour in the synagogue at Nazareth read the *Haphtara* for that particular Sabbath, but if so the arrangement must have been different from what was followed in later ages, because the section from the prophets corresponding to the *Parashah Nitzavim* (Deut. xxix. 9-xxxi. 29) is Isaiah lxi. 10-lxiii. 9, as now given in the Massorah, the passage quoted in the New Testament being omitted.

The Vitry Machsor was the *Cycle of the daily and festival services* followed in the Jewish synagogue at Vitry, in France. It was compiled by Rabbi Simcha about A.D. 1100, and included various legal and ritual regulations taken from ancient documents. Two copies only of this book in MS. are now known to exist, of which one is preserved in the British Museum. Under the letter *Thav* Dr. Ginsburg has printed the whole of the treatise on the *Tagim* from the second volume, showing the letters in the Sabbatic lessons from the Pentateuch to which they were attached by the later Jews and the numbers to be affixed to each.

There is more in these signs than is commonly supposed, because the language of our Lord that '*not one jot or tittle (tag) shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled*' indicates that they were known and recognized in His day, and that they had a definite meaning attached to them. Different interpretations have been given of this passage. Some think that the allusion is to the points and accents, but this is impossible, because they were not invented till the fifth or sixth century (A.D.) by the Massoretes of Tiberias. Others say that the tittles were the strokes which constituted the differences between certain letters, as between *Resh* and *Daleth* and *Heth* and *Cheth*, which seems as improbable as the other view. Others suppose that they were intended merely for ornament, to which opinion some support is given by the number attached to the first chapter of Genesis, where in eight cases four *tagim* appear on the *He* in *Elohim*. Others, with some probability, think that they indicate words or passages from which legal enactments applicable to cases not directly provided for in the law or *Midrashim* were to be deduced.

Jacob Ben Asher Ben Jechiel, commonly called Baal Haturim, who flourished in the fourteenth century, in his commentary on the Pentateuch furnishes some information as to the views of the Jews about their meaning in that age. He says that the seven *tagim* on the *Shin* in the word *Israel* in Gen. xlv. 2 denote that the just man may fall seven times and rise again (Proverbs xxiv. 16), but they do not appear affixed to the term in the printed Massorah. He says that in Deut. vi. 8 the *Teth* in the Hebrew for *frontlets* has nine *tagim* to denote the nine parts of the human head, but the Machsor shows only five. At Ex. iv. 12 the *He* in the Hebrew term for *I will teach thee* has five *tagim* to denote that God taught Moses by the five books of the law, but there are only four in the printed text. The rubrics discuss the number applicable to particular words, being often at variance with themselves, thus reflecting in this as in other cases the diversity of opinion which existed among the Massoretes.

The *Talmud* attributes to the *tagim* great antiquity. In the *Gemara* on the *Mishnic* treatise *Sabbath* it is said that when Moses went up to the mount he found the Almighty attaching them to certain letters, and that they were afterwards seen engraven on the two tables of stone on which the law was written. Maimonides, who lived at the end of the twelfth century, speaks of their shape, which he says resembled the letter *Zajin*, in which form they now appear in the Machsor, and of the letters which received them, the number

varying from one to seven. The *tagim* were affixed only to words in the Pentateuch, and have long since entirely disappeared from the printed editions of the Hebrew Bible.

Under the letter *Mem* the rubric marked 428 refers to a list of terms which occur twice in the Old Testament, in the same form but with a different meaning in each case. It is of great interest, because although the Massorah does not furnish any assistance in determining the meaning of words, it points out the places where in the opinion of the Massorites a variation should be looked for. Illustrations are to be found at Hosea iv. 7 and Isaiah xvii. 6, where *amir* is rendered in the former place by the E.V., R.V., and Septuagint *I will change*, and in the latter by each, *uppermost bough*; at Deut. xxii. 10 and Prov. iii. 29, where *tacharosh* is rendered in the former by each *thou shalt not plough*, and in the latter *devise not*; at Isaiah liii. 7 and Ezekiel xiv. 7, where *nahaneh* is rendered in the former by the E.V. *he was afflicted* (*yet he humbled himself*, R.V.) and by the Septuagint *because of his affliction*, and in the latter by each *I will answer*; and at Prov. xiv. 30 and xix. 10, where *besarim*, which is a *hapax legomenon*, in the former is rendered by the E.V. and R.V. *a sound heart is the life of the flesh*, by the Septuagint *a meekspirited man is a healer of the heart*, and in the latter by the E.V. and R.V. *over princes* and by the Septuagint *with haughtiness*, i.e. in a princely fashion.

On the other hand there are cases in this list where the Massorites recognized a difference of meaning in the terms which does not appear either in the E.V. or the Septuagint. At 2 Kings iv. 39 and Isaiah xxvi. 19 *oroth* is rendered in both cases by the E.V. *herbs* (*light*, R.V.; marg. in the latter), with which the Targum of Jonathan, the Vulgate Syriac and Arabic versions substantially agree. In the former the Septuagint seems to have been at fault, for they have merely given, as in other similar cases, the Hebrew term in a Greek form, ἀρωθ, and in the latter they have translated by a paraphrase, *the dew from thee is healing to them*, which shows that in both cases they must have had a Hebrew text different from that now in use. The Syriac Vulgate and Targum of Jonathan render by the *dew of light*. Fuerst and Gesenius agree with the E.V. Another illustration is found at Psalm xxii. 16 and Isaiah xxxviii. 13, where in the former case the E.V. has rendered *they pierced*, adopting the reading *caru*, for which there is some authority, neglecting the Kethiv *caari*, *as a lion*, and in the latter *as a lion*. In this Massoretic list the reading is in each case *caari*, and elsewhere. Levita said that between many of these terms, as, for example, between Gen. xlviii. 7 and 1 Chron. ii. 19, where the criticism turns upon the term *Ephrath*, and between Numbers xxvi. 15 and Joel ii. 20, where it turns upon *Ts'phon*, which in the former the E.V. renders as a proper name and in the latter by *northern*, in each case agreeing with the Septuagint, there did not seem to be any difference whatever, while the most difficult of all was the pair now under examination, which he declared himself unable to explain. It is not improbable that Psalm xxii. 16 may have been tampered with by the Jews before the rise of the Massoretes, because the Septuagint,

which has been followed by the Vulgate Syriac and Arabic, supports the reading *they pierced*, while the Targum of Jonathan gives *as a lion*. Fuerst and Gesenius accept the latter. According to Tregelles in Gesenius' Lexicon, s.v., Ben Chayim said that he found in some MSS. of the Massorah on Numbers xxiv. 9 the reading *caru* as the correct form at Psalm xxii. 16. The observation runs in the following terms in the Massorah *finalis*: 'In some codices I found the *Kethiv caru* with the *Keri caari*. I have therefore examined those words which are *written* with *vav* at the end of the word, and *read* with *yod*, but have not found this word among them, neither is it to be found in the list of the variations of the Easterns and Westerns.' In the Massorah on the former passage as printed by Dr. Ginsburg under the letter *Aleph*, sec. 1079, Psalm xxii. 16, Isaiah xxxviii. 13, and Ezekiel xxii. 25 are specified as the three other places where *caari* is the correct reading. *Caru*, if accepted at Psalm xxii. 16, is a *hapax legomenon*.

The attempt of Ben Chayim to catalogue the *hapax legomena* did not entirely succeed, owing to his inability to discover a MS. in which he had been told that they were embodied. It is even possible that Dr. Ginsburg may not have noted every case, partly because of the difficulty of accomplishing so arduous a task, and partly because there may be other MSS. containing additional information which he has been unable to consult. Of the 40,000 cases which he has catalogued in the new Massorah the great majority are only variations in form of the same word, which may be called *hapax legomena* improper, the rest being single terms not formed from others, which are comparatively few in number. Of the latter class the interpretation is necessarily difficult, and at best only conjectural, even the Septuagint being occasionally baffled by them.

A few cases with which most students of the Hebrew Bible are familiar will show how Dr. Ginsburg has accomplished his work in this difficult department of the Massorah. At Gen. xxvii. 29 the *hapax legomenon heveh* appears in the list under the letter *Heth* in the new printed text. At ch. xxxi. 47 the Aramaic terms *y'gar sahadutha* have been inserted in their proper place. The Septuagint have rendered *the heap of testimony* so that it is impossible to say whether the words as they now appear in the *textus receptus* were found in the MSS. used by them. At ch. xxxvi. 24 the *hapax legomenon yemim* was noticed by the Massoretes, and appears in the list in its proper place. The Septuagint have rendered it by *ἱαμείν*, as if it were a proper name, showing that they did not understand the term. At Ex. xvi. 23 *ephru*, which occurs only once in this form, is duly noticed in the new Massorah. At Ezra iv. 22 the Aramaic term *hevo* stands in the proper place in Dr. Ginsburg's list. Gesenius and Fuerst in his Lexicon and Concordance do not apparently refer to it. *Hevi* in Isaiah xvi. 4 appears in the new Massorah. *Hozim* in ch. lvi. 10 is also reproduced. *Hotzen* in Ezekiel xxiii. 24 is an undoubted *hapax legomenon*, and is catalogued. At ch. xxvii. 15 the *Kethiv hovnim* is found in the list. At Hosea iv. 18 the difficult *hapax legomenon hevu* is found in the new Massorah. *Huzzab* in Nahum ii. 7 appears in

the list. The Septuagint render by ὑπόστασις, *foundation*. Gesenius in his Lexicon has not noticed the term, and Fuerst regards it as the name of a queen of Assyria.

At the end of the second volume the whole of the Massorah as arranged by Ben Chayim has been reproduced in a separate form, the Massorah *marginalis* being attached to the text and the *finalis* at the end. In the former the rubrics are given, with references to the places where they are printed more fully in the body of the work, with the lists belonging to them, and in the latter the alphabetical arrangement is furnished also with simple references to the critical observations elsewhere. The author intended this to be a help to the student, to enable him to understand the ordinary Massorah as found in different editions of the Rabbinic Bible, and to be a complete key to the Massoretic cryptography. This department of his work entailed upon Dr. Ginsburg enormous labour and great expense.

The limited number of Christian scholars who are able to read the critical observations, now for the first time placed in lexical order, will necessarily prevent a proper appreciation of the value of this great work until the last volume has appeared. It does not, however, require very profound knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic to see that the revision and reconstruction of the *textus receptus* have now become absolutely necessary. What appears in ordinary Hebrew Bibles, although commonly called the Massoretic text, is only the result of criticisms by Buxtorf, Leusden, Vanderhooght, and others of the original as settled, first by Ben Asher and afterwards corrected by Ben Chayim. Whether a thorough revision will ever be attempted must depend on the weight of authority which competent scholars may be disposed to attach to the Massorah as now reconstructed, and to Dr. Ginsburg's interpretation of its doctrines. There are treasures of criticism concealed in its rubrics, which are waiting to be brought to light for the benefit of the Church and of mankind.

Rituale Sacramentorum ad usum Mediolanensis Ecclesiæ, olim a S. Carolo institutum, nunc postremo excellentissimi et reverendissimi D. D. ALOISII NAZARI a CALABIANA archiepiscopi jussu recognitum et auctum. (Mediolani: Ex archiep. typ. Jacobi Agnelli. 1885.)

No *Rituale Ambrosianum* has been published by competent authority for nearly fifty years, and the appearance of this book, containing so many ancient forms of administering the sacraments according to the use of the Church of Milan, may well cause a Churchman interested in liturgical matters to stop for a moment and examine it.

It is well known that S. Charles Borromeo brought out a new edition of the Ambrosian Breviary and of the *Rituale*; but he did not live to see published the edition of the Missal which he had prepared, and which was only given to the world ten years after his death. Since the time of S. Charles the Ambrosian books seem to have remained practically unaltered; but a few years ago it was determined, as new issues were greatly needed in the diocese, to prepare revised editions, in which the books should be corrected and

brought back to the pattern of their most ancient examples. The work of the revision of the Missal was entrusted to the learned prefect of the Ambrosian Library, Dr. Ceriani, by whom it was some months ago finished, though, owing to a few difficulties with Rome, as well as to the desirable slowness with which any liturgical changes should go forward, the Missal itself has not yet been printed, but will very likely appear towards the end of the coming year.

The office of baptism, with which the present book begins, contains a large number of prayers common both to the Gregorian and the Ambrosian rites; but the touching of the child with saliva and saying 'Ephphetha,' and the anointing with the oil of catechumens, take place in the Ambrosian rite at the beginning of the service, while in the Roman and in the Old English præ-Reformation rites they took place at the very end of the office for making a catechumen, and immediately before the administration of baptism. It is also just at this time in the Ambrosian rite, and as the catechumen is being brought into the church for baptism, that the priest changes the colour of his stole from violet to white, not, as in the Roman, after the child has been brought to the font. A trace of the more primitive practice of immersion still survives in the Ambrosian rite, for the priest dips the back of the head in the baptismal water, while in the Roman rite he merely pours the water upon the head. Happily in our Prayer Book the priest is still directed to dip the child in the water 'discreetly and warily,' and it is only when the child is certified to be weak that it is allowed to pour water upon it. Immediately after baptism the priest says with the godfather a short litany in behalf of the newly-baptized. This is noteworthy, for litanies before baptism as part of the blessing of the font are common enough; yet after baptism, as in the Ambrosian rite, they are not often met with. Then, as in the Roman rite, the child is anointed with the chrism, or cream of the Old English, clothed with the white robe, and a lighted candle put into its hand.

After some directions to parish priests as to confirmation, the office for which of course does not appear in the *Rituale*, the next service is that of the administration of the Holy Eucharist. In the Roman Church an unfortunate practice has sprung up, not to use any stronger term, of administering the Holy Communion to the recipient at a time other than that of the actual celebration of the Eucharist. This custom has also crept into the diocese of Milan. In this distribution of the communion a deacon is directed to assist the priest, rather than a mere clerk, a decent rule which we should be glad to see always followed in England in the celebration of the Eucharist; for of late years mere boys and laymen, persons not in holy orders at all, have been permitted to stand at our altars and assist the priest. After confession made by the deacon, and absolution by the priest, the Communion is given, the rubric specially directing each communicant to reply 'Amen' after the words of administration, and the priest to pause until the 'Amen' have been said. It is well known that this saying of 'Amen' by the communicant is a very ancient custom, and was continued in the Church of Paris

dow
said

the
Con
sian
by s
anti
Jan
serv
his t
rece
man
Con
life.

T
ficio
the A
pax
the l
differ
the p
Cree
certa

T
the M
for m
'Tho
toget
here
rite.
not i
parts
to his
Milan
forbid
still
S. Mi
those
a qua

T
for bl
and th
rite.

An
Ritua
thinki
times
appro
hand,

down to our own time, though the *amen* in the Roman rite is now said by the administering priest himself, not by the communicant.

In the order for hearing confessions the penitent has to recite the Lord's Prayer, the Angelical Salutation, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments before he begins his confession, but the Ambrosian form after this is very like the Roman. This office is followed by some curious penitential canons, some of which must be of great antiquity, for they decree punishments for keeping the first of January and for worshipping Jupiter on Thursday. Anyone doing servile work on a Sunday or feast day, or hearing Mass after breaking his fast, is to do penance on bread and water for three days; anyone receiving Communion after breaking his fast is to do penance in like manner for ten days; anyone striking his parents, for seven years. Concubinage with two sisters is followed by penance for the rest of life.

The *Dream of Gerontius* has made familiar to many of us the 'Proficiscere anima Christiana' of the Roman ritual. The same address in the Ambrosian ritual opens with a touching farewell, 'Vale in Christo, pax tecum,' which reminds us at once of the inscriptions on some of the loculi in the catacombs. If at the end of the intercession, which differs in its details from the Roman, the soul have not yet departed, the priest may recite the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' or Athanasian Creed, certain psalms, or the Passion from the Gospels. Then follow certain private prayers which are not contained in the Roman book.

The form for matrimony is very short. The curate merely asks the bride and bridegroom separately whether they take each other for man and wife, and on assent being given, the words of the Gospel, 'Those whom God,' &c., are said, and the priest then knits them together in matrimony in the name of the Holy Trinity. There are here very few differences between the Ambrosian and the Roman rite. But the words of assent to the marriage are, strange to say, not in Italian; and this is the more noteworthy because in other parts of the book—for example, where the sick man is questioned as to his faith—the questions and answers are in the vulgar tongue. At Milan marriages in the afternoon are discouraged, and those at night forbidden. The practice of marrying in the dead of night seems still to continue in some parts of France, for in the Church of S. Michael at Bordeaux we saw last year a notice on the doors that those who wished to be married in the evening must be in the church a quarter of an hour before midnight.

The rest of the book is taken up by various benedictions, forms for blessing water, houses, ships, religious habits, church furniture, and the like, which have a close resemblance to those in the Roman rite.

After all, the differences between the Roman and the Ambrosian *Ritualia* are very small, and there seem to be no good grounds for thinking that they are more than varieties of what was in ancient times the same text. The Ambrosian order for baptism does not approach the Old-Gallican or Celtic orders for baptism on the one hand, or the Oriental on the other, but follows distinctly the same

lines as the Roman, less closely than our own English rites do, but still to all intents and purposes the same. And it is in the order of baptism that the variation from the Roman is most marked. In the other offices the differences are much less apparent; take, for example, the order for extreme unction, the communion of the sick, hearing confessions, and matrimony, which are very nearly the same.

The Ambrosian rite happily seems no longer in any danger, and this is very likely due to the conservative spirit in which the books have been edited by the successive archbishops and their advisers. There has been no root-and-branch destruction of the old customs, such as took place in France after 1680, and which enabled the enemies of local rites in our own time to attack successfully the diocesan books as mere modern vagaries, and, on the plea of restoring antiquity, to replace them with the dull uniformity of the Roman ritual. If we wish to see to-day what a French rite was like before 1680, and therefore what was akin to our own Sarum, we must go, not to any cathedral or parish church across the Channel, but to the chapel of some Dominican convent, probably at our own doors. This order has kept, and spread wherever it has gone, the liturgical customs of the country in which it first sprang up; and so the mediæval Gallican rite survives in foreign countries 200 years after it has disappeared from its own home in the secular churches of France. Thus preserved, it may still be studied as a living rite, even as the Mozarabic may be seen at Toledo and the Ambrosian at Milan.

Le 'Liber Pontificalis.' Texte, Introduction et Commentaire. Par M. L'ABBÉ L. DUCHESNE. Fascic. 1 et 2. (Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1884, 1885.)

SOME years ago the Abbé Duchesne published a valuable *Etude sur le 'Liber Pontificalis,'* in which strong reasons were advanced for assigning an earlier date than had previously been given to the first part of the work which has come down to us in connexion with the name of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. The learned Abbé argued that the earlier part of this was drawn up in the pontificate of Hormisdas, and that the 'Catalogue of Felix IV.,' instead of being, as previous writers had supposed, the original germ out of which the *Liber Pontificalis* had grown, was really an abridgment of the larger work, which was already in existence.

This *Etude* the Abbé, who has made the subject peculiarly his own, is now following up by the magnificent edition of the book itself which now lies before us. When complete it is intended to form two large quarto volumes, which, if we may judge from the parts already published, are destined to be tolerably bulky ones. Only the first two fasciculi are as yet published, containing an immense amount of prefatory matter, and the text of the actual work so far as the pontificate of Vigilius, with elaborate notes upon it. The introductory chapters leave nothing to be desired in the matter of thoroughness, and it is impossible within the compass of a 'short notice' to convey to our readers any adequate idea of the immense amount of information collected together in them. In the first we

have a full account of the various early catalogues of the Popes, including an interesting section on the medallions in the ancient Basilica of S. Paolo fuore le Mura. The second is devoted to a discussion of the date of the *Liber Pontificalis*; and to this we must refer our readers for the arguments by which the Abbé, as we think, conclusively proves his point, that the original edition was the work of a contemporary of Anastasius II. and Symmachus. Chapter iii. prepares the way for an attempted restoration of this original edition by means of the catalogue of Felix IV., and another abridged catalogue down to the pontificate of Conon; and by combining these two independent abridgments a clever attempt is made on pp. 47-107 to restore the text to its primitive form. Chapter iv., which is devoted to an examination of the sources of the work, is full of valuable materials for history relating to the early Popes; it contains, e.g., a discussion of the *vexata questio* of their order, and an investigation of a large number of well-known traditions, such as that of Pope Eleutherus and the British prince Lucius, the legend of Sylvester, &c. It is altogether an excellent piece of work, and deserving of careful study by all who would estimate the value of the Abbé's labours. The fifth chapter, which is still incomplete, contains an account of the various MSS. of the 'second edition,' a notice of those of later editions being promised in the introduction to vol. ii. How much more 'introduction' is yet to come it is impossible to say, as by a rather awkward arrangement it is only published in instalments of so many pages in each number, followed abruptly by a portion of the text and commentary. Thus in the first number published the introduction came to a sudden end actually in the middle of a sentence in chapter iv., on the sources of the work, and we had to wait almost a year for the completion of the unlucky sentence and the remainder of the Abbé's remarks on the subject. This, however, is but a passing inconvenience which time will remedy; and we strongly advise all our readers who are interested in the early history of the Church of Rome not to lose the opportunity of becoming subscribers to this admirable edition of a work which is indispensable to the student of ecclesiastical history and archæology. Full of mistakes and impossibilities as are the lives of the early Bishops of Rome, yet it is often of the utmost importance to know what was believed about them in the sixth century, when there is every reason to think that the first part of the work was compiled. The editor's words are perfectly true—

'Dans le récit proprement dit notre auteur est souvent contredit par les documents authentiques; néanmoins son témoignage conserve encore une grande valeur, car, s'il ne peut servir à démontrer la vérité des faits racontés, il établit au moins l'antiquité des traditions qui les ont fournis' (p. clxi).

We are not concerned, for instance, to defend the accuracy of the statement made with regard to Pope Alexander: 'Hic passionem Domini miscuit in predicatione sacerdotum [quando missæ celebrantur].' It may be utterly worthless historically, but if it could be believed and accepted at the beginning of the sixth century it is

VOL. XXI.—NO. XLI.

Q

quite evident that the 'passion' must have long since found a place in the Mass, and then what becomes of the ingenious argument which Mr. Ffoulkes has elaborated in his latest work? So far as we recollect, in his book on the *Primitive Consecration of the Eucharistic Oblation* from beginning to end there is not the slightest allusion to the statements of the *Liber Pontificalis*. And yet we cannot afford to ignore them, as they enable us to a certain extent to get behind the Gregorian Sacramentary, and to discover what was the belief of the Roman Church in the days of Symmachus and Hormisdas with regard to the date at which different features had been added to the Liturgy.

We have only to add that the type and general 'get up' of the book leave nothing to be desired. The second fasciculus is furnished with an interesting plan on a large scale of the ancient Church of S. Peter, and the photographic facsimiles of MSS. are excellent.

Le Psautier de Metz : texte du XIV^e siècle. Édition critique publiée d'après quatre manuscrits, par FRANÇOIS BONNARDOT. Tome 1, Texte intégral. (Paris : Vieweg, 1885.)

THE elegant little volume published quite recently by M. Bonnardot is the first instalment of a work to which we have had already occasion to allude, and which is described by M. Berger in his *Bible Française au moyen âge*. Let us notice, in the first place, that the Book of Psalms was the earliest portion of the Holy Scriptures translated into French ; the copies of it either with or without glosses are extremely numerous, and the comparative study which it suggests is of the highest importance both for the history of mediæval literature and for that of the versions of the Bible produced on the other side of the Channel.

About four years ago a German scholar, Dr. Apfelstedt, published from an incomplete MS. the *Lothringischer Psalter*, a new edition of which has now been undertaken by M. Bonnardot ; his text, carefully transcribed, was accompanied by a grammatical Introduction explaining the principal characteristic of the idiom of Lorraine ; but, as we said just now, it had the drawback of being taken from an imperfect codex, and of ignoring altogether the three other MSS. which the French *savant* has been able to consult. This deficiency has at last been supplied, and we now possess in its integrity a Psalter written in fourteenth-century French, which, although it is not, as was first supposed, the book used by the Vaudois residing at Metz, is full of much real interest from every point of view.

All we can do at present is to describe briefly the MSS. upon which M. Bonnardot has had to work. The first and best known is preserved at the Mazarine Library in Paris under the No. 798 ; it is a small volume, originally the property of the Oratorian Fathers. The psalms are divided according to the order of the *Nocturns* of the Roman Catholic Church : each group was originally preceded by a miniature illumination, and five of these having been cut out, certain psalms and portions of psalms which were written at the back of these

are missing. Next to the psalms come the canticles (1st, Isaiah xii. 1-6; 2nd, Isaiah xxxviii. 10-20; 3rd, 1 Kings ii. 1-10; 4th, Exod. xv. 1-19; 5th, Habak. iii. 1-19; 6th, Deut. xxxii. 1-56; 7th, the Benedictus; 8th, the Magnificat; 9th, the Benedictus; 10th, the Nunc dimittis), then the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ave Maria, and a Litany containing invocations to certain saints of Lorraine origin, such as S. Kintin (Quentin), S. Gary (Goëry), S. Barbe, S. Glossine, S. Sequelenne, and S. Odellie. The names of Bernard, Dominic, and Francis also occur, and the MS. concludes with a few collects.

The second codex to which we shall call the attention of our readers is to be found in the British Museum (Harleian No. 4327). It has no illuminations, and, like the previous one, seems to have been written about the year 1365. The Calendar, which forms the introduction, is strictly Lorraine, and, in addition to the names of the saints, it gives those of a considerable number of bishops of Metz, memoranda of the dedication of churches, and other ecclesiastical particulars. The psalter is complete with the exception of one leaf corresponding to Psalm xcvi. 7-xcvii. 8. The canticles are followed by, 1st, the Apostles' Creed *en romans*; 2nd, the Ave Maria; 3rd, the Athanasian Creed in Latin; 4th, the Little Hours of the Virgin; 5th, the Litany used at Metz; 6th, the Penitential Psalms; 7th, the collects; 8th, the vigils for the dead; 9th, the Athanasian Creed in French. We may further notice that the Penitential Psalms are the transcript of those which occur in the ordinary course of the psalter, whereas those belonging to the burial service differ considerably from them.

The MS. 9572 of the Paris National Library comes next; it was written during the fourteenth century, and belonged originally to Michel de Barissy and to Aimée de Gournay, his wife, both well known in connexion with the history of the Reformation at Metz. In the MS. the text is more concise; the psalter is followed by the canticles, then come the Apostles' Creed, the Ave, and the beginning of S. John's Gospel.

Finally, we are indebted to M. Bonnardot for the discovery of a MS. copy of the Penitential Psalms (Epinal Library, No. 189), written during the fifteenth century, or even perhaps (in part at least) towards the end of the fourteenth. This codex was the property of the Esch family, one of the most distinguished at Metz; the language differs from that of the other three MSS., and is the popular *patois* of Lorraine.

Such are the materials used by the learned author; he has selected the Mazarine text as the groundwork of his volume, carefully adding in the footnotes the various readings of the three others. We must not forget to mention a most remarkable Preface or Introduction (*Maz.* 798, *Paris* 9572), giving an account of the Lorraine psalter, and explaining both how difficult the translation was from the Latin, and also how necessary such a work is for the edification and moral improvement of the people. The MS. 9572 suppresses several developments admitted by *Maz.* 798, and

terminates in a much more abrupt manner; immediately after the Preface comes a series of reflexions ascribed to S. Augustine, but evidently the production of another unknown writer, for they are found neither in the authentic nor in the apocryphal works of the Bishop of Hippo; such at least is the opinion of M. Samuel Berger, a competent critic, from whose *Bible Française au moyen âge* we have borrowed the substance of many of the above remarks. M. Bonnardot announces his intention of publishing the Latin original of these *Dicta Sancti Augustini* in the appendix to his second volume; we shall not, therefore, dwell upon them at any further length.

With reference to the Introduction itself we may observe here that the anonymous author, whilst enumerating the difficulties he has encountered in his task of translating the psalter de *latin en roumant*, offers remarks applicable to all the versions of the Holy Scriptures in whatever language, and he declares that science and literary skill alone do not avail the usual translator, inasmuch as the qualities required by him are 'dons especial dou Saint Esperit, qui n'est mies à touz connect mais a bien poc de gent.' He then goes on to make a statement which is not strictly correct—namely, that he has not added anything of his own; we believe, on the contrary, that a close parallel study both of the text and of the version would bring to light certain differences not altogether unimportant. The book is well printed, and in addition to the various readings it gives us references to sundry questions which will later on be discussed at much greater length.

La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes en Palestine, en Egypte, et en Assyrie. Par F. VIGOUROUX. 4 vols. (Paris: Berche et Tralin, 1884, 1885.)

THIS is the fourth edition of a work which (if we are not mistaken) was originally published in two volumes, but which has grown in successive editions until it now fills four bulky volumes, containing about 600 pages apiece. The publication of such books as this which now lies before us, or the deeply interesting work of the late François Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'Histoire d'après la Bible et les Traditions des Peuples Orientaux*, ought not to be overlooked among the signs of the times. They give evidence not merely of an activity of thought and keen interest in research, but also of a readiness to accept the results of the latest discoveries, and an enthusiasm for Biblical archaeology among members of the Roman Communion, which is worthy of all praise, but which comes as a surprise to many people. M. Vigouroux, who is one of the clergy of S. Sulpice, is not unnaturally a far more conservative critic than was M. Lenormant, and does not venture on the bolder and at times startling methods of interpretation which the latter applied to the early chapters of Genesis. At the outset, in combating the destructive criticism of the day, he takes up the position 'Tout ou rien,' and thus pledges himself to defend the traditional interpretation throughout. Indeed he holds a brief even for the Deutero-Canonical books, and makes a desperate attempt to defend the historical accuracy of the statements of the book of

Judith—an attempt which we scarcely think he can himself regard as satisfactory, and which is not likely to convince any who need convincing. But still the *facts* which he sets before us are easily separated from the theory in defence of which they are marshalled; and the manner in which they are stated, whether they make for or against the author's views, is fairness itself. Hence, without accepting all his conclusions or necessarily endorsing the uncompromising position, 'Tout ou rien,' with which he starts, we can cordially recommend the work as giving a most complete summary of the results of all the recent discoveries which in any way throw light on the Old Testament.

A preliminary chapter gives an admirable account of the labours of Champollion and other pioneers in the work of deciphering the hieroglyphic and cuneiform inscriptions. Then follows the detailed comparison, wherever possible, of the statements of the Bible with those of the inscriptions. This is given at far greater length than in Mr. Sayce's useful little book, *Fresh Light from the Monuments*, and is quite the fullest work of the kind with which we are acquainted. The Pentateuch is considered at great, perhaps excessive, length, and, not content with occupying two whole volumes, overflows into a third. The rest of this contains the history down to the schism of the ten tribes, while the fourth volume is devoted to the days of the kingdom, the captivity, and the return. It will be seen from this that the ground covered is tolerably extensive, but, so far as we have been able to test them, the statements are thoroughly trustworthy, and well up to date. Thus there is a careful account of M. Naville's identification of Tell el Maskhutah with Pithom, although the volume was published before the appearance of the now famous Memoir. The only omission we have noticed is that of Mr. Theophilus Pinches' definite identification of Pul with Tiglath-Pilezer. The omission is the more surprising as the fourth volume, containing the discussion on Pul, is dated 1885, while the discovery of Mr. Pinches was announced in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* as far back as May 1884, and was noticed in Dr. Cheyne's *Commentary on Hosea*, published last year. It is only fair to add that everywhere else M. Vigouroux shows an intimate acquaintance with the *Transactions and Proceedings* of the Society just mentioned, as indeed he does with all the English literature on Assyriology and Egyptology, as well as with that of his own country and of Germany.

It is natural, before leaving the subject, to say a few words on the relation of the work before us to Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, the first volume of which is now happily rendered accessible to English readers in the *Theological Translation Fund Library*. (If only all the translations in the said 'Library' were but one-half as valuable!) While there is naturally much which is common to the two works, that of M. Vigouroux will be found to cover a wider field. It is not confined to Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions, but includes those of Egypt and embraces an account of geographical discoveries in Palestine as well. Thus its range is far more extensive than the comparatively narrow sphere to which

Schrader confines himself, and though for the Assyrian scholar this latter work is indispensable, yet for the general reader we are inclined to recommend the work of the French divine. Schrader, it must be confessed, is terribly dry reading, and this is a charge which no one can bring against M. Vigouroux, whose style, on the contrary, is bright and pleasant, and whose work is enlivened by an excellent series of plates and illustrations.

History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. By EDWARD (WILHELM EUGEN) REUSS. Translated, with numerous Bibliographical Additions, by EDWARD L. HOUGHTON, A.M. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1884.)

THIS work will undoubtedly be useful, because it contains in a collected form great numbers of facts which no other work contains all together, and which have hitherto required to be sought for through many books. But it will be much *less* useful than it would have been, to Churchmen at all events, because of the very free handling to which it subjects the sacred canon. Scarcely one of the Books of Scripture is left with its authority unimpaired, its authorship unquestioned, or at the very least its text severely retrenched. And without denying the claims of Biblical criticism and the progress it has made as a science, we should not be prepared to encourage, for instance, theological students or learners of any class to regard every traditional fact as more or less doubtful, or to treat every part of the Church's belief with respect to Holy Writ as an open question. That is really the ground taken up by Professor Reuss; and in our judgment it confines the usefulness of the book to persons already assured in the faith. Beyond the question of the text, the attitude of a writer towards the further question of naturalism or supernaturalism determines more than anything else his standpoint. Now, as to this, Professor Reuss appears to us to take up consistently a naturalistic position all through. For him it is a purely natural process, that of the evolution of thought which he is examining, and which he is therefore at full liberty to speak of as he may please. This theory we are not prepared to concur in. No doubt that which Christians speak of as inspiration has a strictly human side and a method which moves by steps and degrees. But that this can be correctly estimated while the Divine factor in it is ignored we must take leave to deny.

That, however, is the assumption upon which Professor Reuss proceeds; and we differ from so many of the conclusions to which he comes that we are put under a difficulty in a 'short notice' like the present. What we object to is not only the conclusions themselves, but their *arbitrary* character and the insufficiency of tangible evidence adduced on their behalf. Writers of the school to which Professor Reuss belongs remind us constantly of that often-quoted saying of Bishop Butler that 'it is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious; and accordingly they treat it as if in the present age this were

an agreed point among all people of discernment. . . .’ Similarly Professor Reuss habitually writes as if the falsity of the ‘received’ or traditional beliefs respecting the component parts of the Scriptures was matter of common notoriety ‘among all people of discernment,’ and hardly needed to be expressly postulated. Thus, speaking of the origin of the Gospels, he pronounces the belief that ‘an Apostle or one of the earliest disciples sought in this way to preserve his own recollections’ to be ‘wholly incapable of proof’ (p. 172). That, however, is simple nonsense. Any historical statement is capable of proof or disproof. The mere fact that it is made is an *à priori* evidence in its favour, which may of course be rebutted by stronger opposing evidence, but ought not to be ignored. In this case, however, we are probably to understand Professor Reuss as expressing his opinion that the statement in question has not, in fact, been proved. But how, we reply, can it possibly be proved, if the judge refuses to listen to the only witness, *i.e.* the tradition of the Church, and orders it out of court? For a belief in historical testimony he substitutes belief in the individual critical judgment, a thing altogether subjective and empirical, and of which the inherent uncertainty is sufficiently shown by the fact that hardly two of its expositors agree in their conclusions. ‘Quot homines, tot sententiæ.’ It is too little remembered that the quasi-scientific character which is imparted to Biblical criticism by the adoption of *general principles* of judgment is principally on the outside. The entire *nodus* of the question, and of every question that it examines, lies in the *application* of these, and this is essentially arbitrary and subjective, because it cannot be otherwise. It is the judgment of the individual mind, which cannot fully communicate the grounds and processes of its action to any other. Thus we find, with regard to the Fourth Gospel, that

‘the numerous discourses which are put into the mouth of Jesus, and which properly constitute the kernel and essence of the book, we hold to be in form and setting the work of the writer. The relation between the speaking Saviour and His hearers, as it is here represented, is not in keeping with the sufficiently attested condescension of Jesus to the people in His teaching.’

Here we have the author’s subjective decision; and if we ask Why? he has only to speak of ‘lack of clearness,’ ‘psychological impossibility,’ and so on. To our mind, on the contrary, these very discourses in the Fourth Gospel ‘shine by their own light,’ and display their Divine wisdom unmistakably. We could sooner doubt the authenticity of any other series of discourses, even in the Gospels, than these; and to our mind such a sentence as that quoted above shows a sad deficiency and dulness in spiritual insight. We must express, in the most unqualified manner, our disagreement with Professor Reuss’s opinion.

This, however, is but one division of the book, and we do not know that we have much to say of the later divisions, in which Professor Reuss traces the history of early recensions, and versions, and afterwards of the chief printed editions, all of which may be con-

sulted for concise summaries of the chief facts and will certainly be found useful to the student.

Egypt and Babylon, from Scripture and Profane Sources. By the Rev. G. RAWLINSON, M.A., Canon of Canterbury. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1885.)

THE plan of this volume is simple. Each Scriptural passage which deals with Babylon is quoted textually from the A.V.; then follow the elucidations, &c., gathered from classical records, recent monumental research, and the like. This, for Babylon, completes Part I., in twelve chapters. Then follows in Part II. the same process in twelve more for Egypt.

I. The 'Notices of Babylon in Daniel' take precedence of those in Jeremiah, probably because they are so largely historical, whereas as regards Egypt they are predictive. The work is in effect a well-compiled commentary of illustration, in which sacred history is reinforced by secular record, and prophetic prediction is verified by the same. Our specimens must be few. Here is the attestation, gathered from an ancient, much mutilated Babylonian cylinder,¹ to the story of the Confusion of Tongues, which had long remained an unconfirmed prehistoric marvel. It appears to be metrical, and we give the second stanza entire from p. 13.

Their work all day they builded ;
But to their stronghold in the night
Entirely an end God made.
In His anger also His secret counsel He poured forth ;
He set His face to scatter ;
He gave command to make strange their speech ;
Their progress He impeded.

The monotheistic style of the above is itself noteworthy. Our other specimen shall be the prophecy of Jeremiah, the supposed non-fulfilment of which was long a favourite coigne of vantage for the sceptics. The words are (Jer. xliii. 9, 10), 'Take great stones in thine hand, and hide them in the clay in the brick-kiln, which is at the entry of Pharaoh's house in Tahpanhes. . . . Thus saith the Lord of Hosts . . . Behold, I will send and take Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, My servant, and will set his throne upon these stones that I have hid, and he shall spread his royal pavilion over them'; compare xli. 13-26; Ezek. xxix. 18, 19; xxx. 10, in which numerous chief cities in Egypt are threatened by name. We see from the date of one of these latter, delivered 573 (549?) B.C., that the event which was to fulfil them all was then future. It appears that a statue now in the Louvre, set up first at Elephantine, bears an inscription showing that at that spot in Upper Egypt the advance of 'the foreign hordes of the Syrians, the people of the north, the Asiatics,' was arrested. To confirm this we have a votive tablet of Nebuchadnezzar to his God, much mutilated, showing how he 'to Egypt to make war

¹ Now in the British Museum, deciphered by the late Mr. George Smith.

went. [His army Ama]sis, King of Egypt, collected . . . ' The record appears to be defective, but no one can doubt from the proem, which is, 'My enemies thou usedst to destroy, thou causedst my heart to rejoice,' &c., that a triumphant issue of this passage of arms is meant to be celebrated; that Nebuchadnezzar, in fact, overran Lower and Middle Egypt, but did not further pursue his advantage, or was arrested in his course. A difficulty, arising from the statue pertaining to the period of Apries, whereas the tablet appears to name Amasis as the king, is explained by another monument, which shows that during six years they reigned conjointly, while 'the expedition of Nebuchadnezzar, being in B.C. 568 (544?), falls exactly into this interval.' We have put a query to the dates given by Canon Rawlinson, who seems to follow the chronological margin of the A.V., whereas a recent recalculation of the eclipse of Thales, now timed at 586 instead of 610 B.C., throws the received dates of this period twenty-four years later. This, however, is a trifling detail. Although a mere compilation from the works of Brugsch, G. Smith, Sir H. Rawlinson, and others, we regard the work as a very useful handbook for its own purpose.

II. The points of contrast between the Egypt of the successive books of the Bible and that of the monuments is given in sufficient detail, and the parallels traceable seem both numerous and exact. A vast network of confirmations of the sacred narrative has been gathered from Egyptian sources during the last thirty years. The minuteness, commonplace character, and even triviality of some of the circumstances noted are really the measure of their evidential importance. It is only by rare accident that professed histories touch upon such points as illustrate the life of an ancient people in its homelier details; but it is the specialty of the Biblical narrative that it is replete with these, and therefore challenges comparison with those self-delineations of social and domestic occurrences towards reproducing which the realistic efforts of the ancient artists were so largely directed. There could be no greater peril to a spurious narrative than to venture on such familiar trifles. But this, of course, more easily and completely establishes the character of the Scriptural narratives as artlessly genuine.

There are a few minor points where a greater degree of care might have been desirable. The passage which has become proverbial concerning the 'flesh pots' of Egypt is 'accounted for by supposing that the king nourished his labourers on a more generous diet than was obtainable by the working classes generally.' But the passage only tells us that the Israelites '*sat by the flesh pots and did eat bread to the full*,' which need mean no more than some sort of soup in which flesh was an ingredient. The words of murmurers at their present lot naturally dwell in exaggeration on the retrospect, and, presenting its features in the most favourable view, often seem to mean more than the literal facts would have warranted. On the next page the record (Herod. ii. 125) on Cheops' pyramid is referred to as in effect stating that the labourers employed thereupon 'subsisted mainly, if not wholly, on radishes, onions, and garlic,' where

the commentator, himself an editor of Herodotus, would seem to have overlooked the context in which the historian wonders, if so much was spent on those vegetables, how much more would have been spent on tools, staple diet (*suria*), and clothing, showing clearly that the fare did *not* consist 'mainly, if not wholly,' of the vegetables mentioned. The bad rendering of the word in Exod. iii. 22, which merely means 'take' by 'borrow' in the A.V., might reasonably have been so corrected, as conveying a false notion. But these and the like are minor oversights. On p. 337 the list of Egyptian names of Palestinian captured cities, &c., in the bas-relief of Sheshonk I. (Shishak), with their Scriptural identifications, is remarked upon. But why not have given the much earlier and longer similar list recorded on the substructures of the porch of the Temple at Karnak by Thutmes III., recording his great victory at Megiddo? (See Brugsch, i. pp. 349-351.) This list, being earlier than the conquest of Joshua, has the further advantage of showing how large a proportion of the ancient nomenclature was retained after that conquest. One may point out that the pressure of the Hittite empire on the upper margin of Syria was probably the proximate cause which impelled the Hyksos and their tribes over the lower margin upon Egypt. Of the invasion itself we seem to learn hardly anything from the monuments, owing to their studied defacement. It was probably a swarming over of successive tribes from the adjacent pastoral wastes of Arabia and the Negeb, not a single definite expedition under a distinct leader—more, in short, like that mixture of immigration and invasion which the Angles practised against the Britons than like the onslaught led by William the Conqueror. *How* these swarms settled down, adopted Egyptian customs, and consolidated their power in a monarchical form, are questions asked in vain in the present state of our Egyptology.

First Successors of the Holy Apostles in the Christian Church. Compiled by G. MILNE HOME. (London: Smith, 1885.)

ANY youthful students of Church history who master this modest compilation will find that they have not only learned a great many important facts, but that they have also imbibed much information respecting the tone of mind prevalent in early Christendom. Actual documents, even in a translation, impart this valuable species of knowledge with a power which modern narratives based upon them seldom succeed in obtaining. It has been justly noted as one of the blemishes in Macaulay's histories that he almost always insists on giving his citations in his own modernized dress, instead of presenting them in the perhaps ruder, but certainly often more impressive, form of a direct quotation, or of a closely literal rendering.

Miss Milne Home could not, of course, within the space of some 250 pages furnish us with specimens of every one of the Fathers commonly termed Apostolic; but if extracts from Hermas and Barnabas are absent, this is no more than may be said of other collections of the kind, as, for example, the edition of the Apostolic Fathers by the late Bishop Jacobson. Against these, to our thinking, less interesting

writer
men
carp,
right
also t
carp,
and a
we m
by B
T
notes
that
Miss
great
to cri
in ca
may.
A
tical
just
Hegel
monl
does
eccle
and
at p.
inspi
the e
rist s
the t
cuss
C
Engl
that
Holy
that
secre
does
monl
contr
the C
xi. 2
Evan
admi
much
or re
sense
vigor
is (in
this v

writers we have to place specimens of the writings of such saintly men as both the Clements (Rome and Alexandria), Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus. Tertullian has, we think, been rightly included, despite his sad lapse into Montanism. There are also the early accounts of the martyrdoms of S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp, portions of the Liturgy of S. James and of the Gallican Liturgy, and a translation of the whole of the newly discovered *Didachê*, as we may venture, for brevity's sake, to term the strange treatise edited by Bishop Bryennius.

The abridgments seem to us well done, and the memoirs and notes for the most part very suitable for the compiler's object—namely, that of making the extracts intelligible. We are really grateful to Miss Milne Home for her volume, and think it calculated to do a great deal of good. Just, however, for this very reason we proceed to criticize a few points which might be well worth thinking over, in case it should reach a second edition, as we sincerely hope it may.

At p. 3 we read that 'Eusebius . . . was the first ecclesiastical historian.' This statement would be more exact if to the words just quoted were added 'whose writings have come down to us.' Hegesippus, who must have flourished a full century earlier, is commonly regarded as the father of Church history. Again, our author does not clearly impress upon her readers that the term *Liturgy* in ecclesiastical writings means the office for the Holy Communion and nothing else. It is well and good to proclaim (as is here done at p. 104 and elsewhere) the superiority of inspired writings to uninspired ones. Nevertheless a comparison between the Psalms and the earlier Church offices for the administration of the Holy Eucharist seems to us a little perplexing, because the scope and object of the two compositions are so diverse that it is barely possible to discuss them side by side.

One other feature of the book calls for notice. The Church in England has allowed considerable latitude respecting the nature of that mysterious Presence which is vouchsafed to the faithful in the Holy Eucharist. She does not, however, tolerate on the one hand that metaphysical theory which represents the substance of the consecrated elements as ceasing to exist; still less, on the other hand, does she allow that they remain mere unchanged signs, a theory commonly associated with the name of Zwinglius, but one in utter contradiction to the whole tone of her office and to the language of the Catechism. Miss Milne Home quotes an explanation of 1 Cor. xi. 24 which lies between these two extremes, being that of Canon Evans in *The Speaker's Commentary*. It is in many respects an admirable piece of writing. The opening words run thus: 'The much-controverted *is* means precisely *is*. It never can mean *signifies* or *represents*, nor can it combine, as some [have supposed?], both senses *is* and *signifies*.' The writer proceeds to set forth with much vigour and force what has been often called the virtual theory. 'This is (in effect) My body.' Now we only wish to observe that, while this view may be thought to derive support from early and even from

some mediæval divines, as well as from some Anglican writers of weight, we cannot admit that it is the only theory allowed amongst us. Excellent as a protest against mere Zwinglianism, it may yet seem to some of us to fall short of the highest aspect of true and lawful sacramental doctrine. But these criticisms in no wise militate against the gratitude we have already expressed for the work before us.

Histoire des Romains, depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à l'invasion des barbares. Par VICTOR DURUY, membre de l'Institut. Vol. vii. (Paris: L. Hachette and Co., 1855.)

AFTER many years of assiduous labour and of patient research, M. Duruy has at last completed the new edition of his Roman history, and the seventh volume now before us takes in from the accession of Constantine to the death of Theodosius, on the invasion by the Barbarians. It is difficult to over-estimate the importance of this great work, the care bestowed upon it, the beauty and abundance of the pictorial illustrations (maps, woodcuts, chromo-lithographs, &c.); but if we give it a place in our summary of French literature, it is, as our readers will no doubt conclude, because M. Duruy necessarily deals with the history of the Christian Church. His appreciation of Constantine is a very just one, and the long note he has devoted to the use of the cross as an emblem will interest archæologists. He remarks with much truth on the difficulty of discerning in the writings of the early Fathers what is authentic from what is spurious, and he shows that Eusebius cannot be depended upon. Gelasius himself does not scruple to fabricate a speech supposed to have been delivered by Constantine at the Council of Nicæa; the letter addressed to Arius by the Emperor, and reproduced by Sozomen, is evidently apocryphal. The Duke de Broglie himself (*L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au IV^e Siècle*) talks of *un déluge de pièces fausses*. Theophanes, in his Chronicle, accuses the Arians of having fabricated the constitutions which Constantine was reported to have sent to the Pope; the pretended act of donation made by the Emperor, the legend of his baptism, the spurious decretals, are further proofs in the same direction; and Athanasius is loud in protesting against the scribes who forge not only his own letters, but those of the Emperor Constantine. We thus see how difficult it is to write the ecclesiastical history of the third and fourth centuries, that epoch when considerations of a political nature had to be taken into serious account, and when the greatest caution was absolutely necessary. M. Duruy seems inclined to deny the possibility of miracles, and we need scarcely say that we differ *toto celo* from him on the subject; but the famous legend of the *Labarum* is certainly well calculated to encourage the sceptic, and the contradictory manner in which it has been related by historians is enough to refute it altogether.

After having shown the edict of Milan sanctioning and completing that given by Galerius in 311, our author describes briefly the plain but touching liturgy of the Christian Church. He draws a powerful contrast between the simple-minded disciples who were satisfied with silent meditation, prayer, and the practice of earnest

piety
their
the f
He t
Chri
theo
M
inter

'pres
soph
he ki
of G
surro
Thab
of th
prom
to be
Divin
whol

F
Cons
then
serva
virtu
quar
to hi
that
from
Alex
myth
ciplin
instin

M
readi
equa
clerg
follow
of Ia
plina
exem
never
the o
peron
When
set a
fesse

T
phil
the v
of Po

piety, and the time-servers who, not having the strength 'to place their temper under subjection to their faith,' adopted unhesitatingly the form of religion, whilst their soul was still a prey to every passion. He then conjures up before us the men 'of violent faith,' exciting the Christians to religious wars, and ready to fight for subtle points of theology—the Donatists, for instance.

M. Duruy's account of the Council of Nicæa is one of the most interesting parts of his volume; he notices, very justly, that if Arius—

'preserved the God of the Spirit (*le Dieu de l'Esprit*), which the philosophers of antiquity placed in solitary grandeur on the throne of eternity, he killed the God of the heart, Him whom imagination saw in the plains of Galilee, and on the banks of Jordan, in the midst of the children, surrounded by the holy women, in the glorious transfiguration on Mount Thabor, and on His blood-stained cross, and bursting asunder the gates of the sepulchre, earnest of the universal resurrection which He had promised. That was the God which must be retained if a religion was to be founded. . . . The whole of Christianity consists in the Christ; His Divinity is the great religious novelty; if it is once compromised, the whole structure, however noble, falls to the ground.'

Passing over the chapter devoted by M. Duruy to the reign of Constantius, we must say a few words about the reaction of heathenism under Julian. This Emperor was at the same time a conservative and an innovator: a conservative because his motto was virtually *mos majorum*; an innovator because he borrowed from all quarters the elements of his religious system. Heathenism, according to him, was a principle of stability and of preservation, 'but what was that heathenism? Must it be derived from Greece or from Rome? from Egypt or from Syria? He drew upon Plato and upon the Alexandrine philosophers; he placed under contribution the solar myths of Asia, and even the practices of the Christians whose discipline was in accordance with his moral ideas and his administrative instincts.'

M. Duruy's critique of Julian's fanciful system of theology is worth reading. Singularly unfortunate as a dogmatist, the Emperor was equally unsuccessful in his endeavours to reform the morals of his clergy. The principles of asceticism, which suited admirably the followers of the Gospel, could not adapt themselves to the disciples of Iamblichus, Libanius, and Proclus, and not the strictest disciplinary measures transformed Julian's hierophants into a college of exemplary priests. It is only due to the Emperor to say that he never persecuted the Christians, and on this point M. Duruy quotes the opinion of M. Rendall, who expresses himself thus: '[The Emperor] never authorized any execution on the ground of religion. . . . When his conduct amounted to persecution, he did not abjure, but set a strained interpretation on the laws of toleration which he professed.'

That the endeavour made by Julian to revive heathenism in a philosophic form would be fruitless must have seemed evident from the very first. If the subtleties of the Neo-Platonists and the dreams of Porphyry had been, when originally produced, incapable of weaning

away men from Christianity, was it likely that they would meet with greater success now? M. Duruy shows us 'all the superior men whom nature thus fashioned' passing over to the religion of the cross: Athanasius, Basil, Cyril, the two Gregories, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, Augustine, had found in the Gospel the living God, who explained to them the hypostases of the Alexandrines, and by whose aid they could soar far beyond the abstractions of metaphysics to the contemplation of faith.

Time will not allow us to carry on any further this imperfect review of M. Duruy's seventh volume; enough, however, has been said to give an idea of its merit, and to show its importance as a contribution to the history of the early Church from the dawn of Christianity to the end of the fourth century.

Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret. Par le Baron A. de RUBLE. Vol. iii. (Paris: Labitte, 1883).

ON hearing of the taking of the Bastille by the Paris mob in July 1789, Louis XVI. said to the Duke de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt: 'C'est donc une émeute?' 'Non, sire,' was the answer; 'c'est une révolution.' Reforms were needed, and might have been introduced; the more simple process of cutting everything down and of making a kind of *tabula rasa* was adopted, with what results we can now all see. It was exactly the same with the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Instead of eliminating abuses and merely removing the excrescences accumulated by the Papacy around the venerable fabric of the primitive Church, Calvin, Theodore Beza, and their followers, preferred destroying the whole edifice and building an entirely new structure without any reference to the past. The outcome of this movement has not thoroughly answered the expectations of those who undertook it. The French reformation, from whatever point of view we look at it, cannot escape the reproach of being an attempt to introduce a sort of *imperium in imperio*, a revival of feudalism, a rising of the nobility against the Crown. This seems to us the plain lesson taught us by the valuable work published by Baron de Ruble on Antoine de Bourbon and Jeanne d'Albret—a work the third volume of which has recently appeared. The reign of Francis II. forms the subject of this handsome octavo; we are invited to identify ourselves for a time with a society eaten up by corruption of the foulest kind, and when the terrible consequences of a long series of wars, combined with the Machiavellism brought from Italy to France in the train of Catherine de' Medici, had destroyed every sense of right and wrong.

The Amboise conspiracy organized by La Renaudie under the inspiration of the Prince de Condé forms the centre of interest in the volume before us; and, let us, in the first place, pay a due tribute of praise to Baron de Ruble's artistic qualities. No writer has more thoroughly than himself exemplified all the merits of the modern school of historians. He has carefully studied all the evidence which contemporary documents have to show; the Record Offices of Paris, London, Brussels, Simancas, &c., have been thoroughly explored;

but his erudition is not paraded about, and its results alone are apparent in a picturesque description of France during the sixteenth century, and in striking portraits of the leading personages who took a part in the stirring drama the conclusion of which was to be the murder of the Duke de Guise at Blois.

Francis II. must be noticed first.

'Born at Fontainebleau on January 19, 1544 . . . he ascended the throne when he was barely fifteen years old; he had manifested happy dispositions for a king; he was fond of study and of martial pursuits; but his physical and intellectual development seemed to have suddenly stopped when he reached the period of adolescence. Weak, valetudinarian, too young and mentally deficient, he was notoriously unable to govern. At the very beginning of his reign the people nicknamed him the *little king* ("le petit roi"), a designation which history has confirmed. Parliaments, courtiers, citizens and captains—no one took seriously the majority of a prince who had not yet reached seventeen, and who was notoriously below his age as far as ability was concerned.'

Let the reader imagine a crowned nonentity of that description between the Guises on the one side and the Condés on the other. We feel pretty sure that Baron de Ruble will be accused by some critics of having taken as his authority for the appreciation of the Lorraine princes Regnier de la Planche, a decidedly partizan writer; but we must observe that the very dark colours with which this historian paints the Guises are to be found in other independent sources, and that the evidence of history is overwhelming in representing the *Balafré* in particular as a man whose military talents and undoubted genius were equalled only by his cruelty and his ambition. The brilliant successes he had obtained against the Spaniards made him the darling of the people; and when he compared himself to the degenerate representative of the Valois dynasty who then wore the fleur-de-lys, was it astonishing that he should believe himself to be *de facto* the king of France? What he would have been capable of if he had wielded the sceptre may be easily guessed by the ruthless manner in which he dealt with the Amboise conspirators, the arrest of Condé, the trial of the Vidame de Chartres, and the repeated attempts he made to get rid of Antoine de Navarre by assassination.

It is not too much to say that the Crown itself was at stake when La Renaudie, with the idea of justifying his *coup de main*, pretended that the Huguenots merely wanted to wrest from Francis II. the dismissal of his favourite ministers. Should the plan have been successful the doom of the Guises was sealed, and probably the king of Navarre would have virtually ruled, until Philip II. had had time to muster his troops and to march them across the Pyrenees.

The Huguenot party, led by the husband of Jeanne d'Albret, would have fared ill indeed if it had not enjoyed also the support of the Condés. It is impossible to speak too contemptuously of Antoine de Bourbon. Boldness and energy are two indispensable qualities in epochs of revolution; now, hesitation, timidity and utter want of principle were the prominent qualities of that monarch. As

Baron de Ruble truly remarks, he allowed himself to be duped by everyone, he behaved in such a fashion that it seemed as if he was bent upon betraying his own supporters, and Philip II. treated him as an adversary who deserved nothing but contempt. It is quite clear that the leaders on the Protestant side were far inferior to the men who looked up to others for advice, example and support; the king of Navarre when denying his complicity in the Amboise expedition was guilty of so palpable a lie that no one could possibly credit it, and, whatever may be said to the contrary, all the attempts at insurrection which marked the years 1559 and 1560 were made with the connivance of the Bourbon princes.

We cannot speak too highly of Baron de Ruble's excellent work; it is undoubtedly the best and the most impartial history which has hitherto appeared of the epoch which it covers, and it illustrates in a particularly dramatic way the political character of the Reformation in France, thus accounting for its shortcomings and pointing out the cause of its ultimate suppression by Cardinal Richelieu.

Israel's Wanderings: a Connected Account tracing the Lost Tribes of Israel into the British Isles. By OXONIAN. (London: The British Israel Identity Corporation, Limited.)

'SOLVENTUR risu tabulæ,' says Professor Freeman, 'is the only treatment for . . . Anglo-Israelites.' They are, however, unlikely to be touched by any sense of the absurd; and this is clearly the case with the writer before us, who complacently derives the Danai, the Damnonii, and the Danes from the tribe of Dan—Scüths, or Scythians, Scots, Goths, Jutes, from *Scoth*, quasi wanderers dwelling in tents—Kimmerians and Kymry from Beth Khumri, the Assyrian name for Israel—and, above all, Saxons and Sakai from Beth-Isaak; who considers the Argonauts to have been traders of the Danite tribe; claims Homer as 'it may be,' Herodotus as 'possibly,' and Alexander as 'in all probability,' of that same stock; reckons Sakya Muni as a descendant of the Ten Tribes (p. 60); thinks that 'Confucius, too, must have been of the elect generations; and adds, with a disappointing abatement of confidence, 'Whether Zoroaster was also of that race I do not know: I am, however, strongly inclined to believe so' (p. 62). He has made out to his entire satisfaction that there were five waves of Israelitish migration which directly affected the British Isles. First, a companionship in travel of Israelites with Canaanites is inferred from Numb. xxxiii. 55 (p. 14); and Judg. v. 17 is made to support a fabric of maritime enterprise on the part of the Danites, in whom we are bidden to recognize the 'Tuatha de Dannan' of Irish 'traditions' (p. 24). Then another batch of Israelitish adventurers is shown to us in the 'Scots,' who joined these 'Danites' in Ulster, and sent a colony into Scotland. (Here we may remark that 'Oxonian's' identification has been anticipated by the lively Greenwich barber in *The Fortunes of Nigel*, who is quite as glib in arguing from 'coincidences': 'The Scotch never eat pork; strange, that! some folks think they are a sort of Jews. There is a resemblance, sir; do you not think so? Then, they call our

most gracious sovereign the second Solomon; and Solomon, you know, was king of the Jews: so the thing bears a face, you see.) What follows we should really have thought it impossible for any one to send to press, revise, and publish. Jeremiah's commission to build and to plant, and Ezekiel's prediction as to the tender cedar twig which was to be 'planted on the mountain of the height of Israel,' are seriously associated (p. 28) with Irish 'traditions' about an Irish arch-king, Eochaidh, who married a princess from the East, and, under the influence of her companions, a prophet unnamed and one Simon Brug, 'abandoned Baalism,' and called his royal seat Tara, which, of course, means '*thorah*, the Law.' Who can 'fail to see,' asks our 'Oxonian,' that Simon Brug is Baruch, the prophet is Jeremiah, and the princess is a daughter of Zedekiah, in whom is verified the promise as to the permanence of the Davidic throne? Thirdly, the Britons whom Cæsar attacked were Israelites, whose fathers had emigrated from Spain (p. 30): these same Kymrians had taken Rome under Brennus, but it was not the will of Heaven that Israel should stop the growth of the Fourth Empire (p. 34); and the Kimbri Israelites, after defeating Servius Cæpio, were afterwards defeated by Marius (p. 82). Fourthly, we have to watch the westward progress of the 'Scüths,' or Scythians, who are simply Israelites escaped from their Assyrian captivity; and here an elaborate reference to Herodotus is paralleled by an argument from the Second Book of Esdras, as to which our author's proceeding is somewhat characteristic (p. 46). He first says that it 'claims for its author Ezra'; then avows that he has strong reasons for thinking that it is rightly so named, 'and, therefore, should have a place in the canon of the Old Testament: then five times cites a passage from chap. xiii. as by 'Ezra.' Well, these 'Scüthic' Israelites drive out the Kimmerian Israelites, who belong to an early migration (p. 56); they withstand and repel the Persians; 'the reply of the Scüthic leaders' to Darius in Herod. iv. 125 has, to 'Oxonian's' ear, 'a true Israelitish ring in it'; their deity, Zalmoxis, may be identified with 'Lord Moses' (p. 70), and their territory on the Dnieper suggests a quotation of Psal. lxxiii. 1. To proceed: as Getæ, they defeat the Macedonians; as Cherusci, under Arminius, eminent among 'Israel's heroes,' they crush the legions of Varus; as Dacians, they keep Rome in terror during the first century (p. 94); in the third, as followers of Odin, they advance from their 'holy city,' Asgard (a recollection of Jerusalem), to the Elbe (p. 98): need we add that as Saxons, Jutes, and Angles (a name which 'brings to mind that Ephraim was called *Engel*, a heifer,' p. 103), they conquer South Britain? But what of the next conquest? Our oracle is prompt and explicit. Let Mr. Freeman learn that at Senlac Israelite met Israelite. Have we forgotten Benjamin? Judah did not receive Christ, therefore those who did receive Him must have been Benjamites; therefore the Church of Jerusalem, which fled to Pella, was Benjamite: so, 'mainly, were the Asiatic Churches of the first two centuries; one section of them, the Galatians, being Israelites of the remnant that escaped' (p. 123), *i.e.* that had never been carried captive

(p. 32 ff). When some Christians of Asia Minor were made captives by the Gauls in 267, they were, in fact, Benjamin coming 'halfway to Britain'; and he came the rest of the way, it appears, in the Normans, who unquestionably 'ravined as wolves,' and who, we are told, were eminently 'the beloved of the Lord,' as being, in Lord Macaulay's words, 'the foremost race in Christendom' (p. 125). 'The two final events in the working out of Israel's political destiny came to pass within a few years of one another. One was the union of Scotland and England under one crown, whereby the whole nation returned to the allegiance of the house of David' (p. 128); the other was 'the formation of the American people, in fulfilment of the prediction that Manasseh as well as Ephraim should be great.' The reader will, ere this, have uttered his *Ohe, jam satis!* but it is worth while to see something of the extravagances which a craze of this Anglo-Israel type can develop, by help of calm assumption, strained coincidences, legendary or imaginary narrative, unsound ethnology, and ridiculous etymology. But there is something more serious yet. It was observed five years ago in this Review (vol. x. 337) that the theory in question, which some fanatics made part of their religion, was gravely dangerous to religious interests, in that it was 'found to weaken the hold of practical religion over its adherents . . . tended to perpetuate erroneous methods of exegesis, and disingenuous ways of dealing with evidence,' and also degraded, by secularizing, the interpretation of Scripture prophecy. We have already seen how 'Oxonian' applies to a supposed daughter of Zedekiah a prophecy which, as the *Speaker's Commentary* tells us, even Jewish opinion regarded as Messianic; and it is, if possible, more revolting to find the Fifth Empire in Daniel deprived of its spiritual significance, and reduced, 'in its earliest stages at least' (p. 4), to the dimensions of an alleged series of wars, invasions, conquests, and colonizations, carried on by a people who had become 'not My people' through apostasy. Truly Judaism turns silver into dross.

Sermons to the Spiritual Man. By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1884.)

THE writer of these sermons was aware that they would be far from meeting the tastes of a large number of people at the present day. There is a prevalent impatience of doctrinal discussions in sermons (and elsewhere), such as once found utterance in the celebrated 'Hang theology' exclamation; and to people who are of such a mind the sermons before us will be, as it were, *caviare*. Dr. Shedd himself declares calmly that his work is 'out of all keeping with some existing tendencies in the religious world,' though without specifying more particularly what those tendencies are. He probably may have had a public nearer home in his mind as he wrote; but in such matters there is little difference between England and America. Nevertheless, for such as can patiently grapple with difficult trains of thought, and appreciate the deliberate treatment upon theological principles of the great problems connected with man's personal and

creaturely (to use an expressive Americanism) existence, these discourses are well suited; and such readers will not be slow to acknowledge that they have here homilies of very unusual depth, power, and suggestiveness. Dr. Shedd has pursued the method of illustrating his own views by apt quotations from other writers; and this is much to the advantage of his work. No plan so emphasizes the points of a discourse, and renders it of permanent value, as the incorporating in it here and there a profound thought or happy expression of some former divine. We regret, however, to observe that, with the exception of a citation or two from S. Augustine, Dr. Shedd has made no use of the Fathers. It is not too much to say that, great as is the value of these sermons, it would have been doubled had they more in them of the 'golden thoughts' of those giants in theology. But we fear that Protestant writers generally have very little idea how rich S. Chrysostom, or S. Gregory, or S. Cyril of Jerusalem are in deep thoughts splendidly worded, not to speak of S. Augustine, whom we have already mentioned.

Under these circumstances we suppose it was a thing to be expected that we should come upon expressions of opinion now and then with which we are unable to sympathize; for example, it appears to us hardly fair to represent the 'dispute between the Protestant and the Papist' as being one 'between the advocate of grace and the advocate of works' (p. 129). It is true that Protestant divines have generally argued against good works, considered as a general requirement for salvation; but theologians even of the Roman communion have never for a moment so argued as if the Divine grace were unnecessary for salvation, or to make it 'of none effect.' Much less would this be true of the non-Roman branches of the ancient Church, such as the Anglican; and we appeal with confidence to Dr. Shedd himself whether that is not the case. The real line of division between the two great sections of Christendom is that indicated by the words Sacramental and non-Sacramental. This distinction is well brought by the next passage which we had marked for mention (from Sermon XII. on 'Pure Motives the Light of the Soul'), in which the statement is broadly made, that as 'there is nothing in the mere prosecution of trade or commerce that is intrinsically right or intrinsically wrong,' so also 'neither is there anything holy, *per se*, in the calling of a clergyman.' Now this may be true, to a certain extent, of the calling merely of a preacher of the Gospel; and we should suppose that this is what Dr. Shedd would contemplate by his phrase of 'the calling of a clergyman.' But we are far from granting that there is nothing holy, *per se*, in the character and calling of a priest of the Catholic Church of Christ: *sanda sanctis*; we take it to be quite the other way. We regret the more to express disagreement with a part of the views put forward, because Sermon IX. especially ('The Creature has no Absolute Merit') is a very noble discourse, and one for which, take it altogether, we feel a great admiration.

The Life of Christ. By Dr. BERNHARD WEISS, Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by M. G. HOPE. Vol. III. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1884.)

It is needless to add much here, in noticing the appearance of the third and concluding volume of this work, to what we have said respecting previous volumes, as to the general character of the work. With regard, however, to particular incidents and subjects, our task would be a long one ; since we are forced to differ from Dr. Weiss as often as he differs from the Evangelists, and this is too frequently the case. Thus, for instance, we are told with regard to our Lord's saying respecting His own Divine Nature and yet human descent from David (S. Matt. xxii. 45), a seed of thought which contains a very deep mystery, and must, we should have imagined, have approved itself instantly to every reverent and thoughtful mind, that 'there is no doubt that the way in which the first Evangelist represents Jesus as closing the mouths of the Pharisees with this question, and so condemning them to a shame-faced silence (Matt. xxii. 41-46), was neither intended by Jesus, nor did it so appear in the oldest account' (p. 200). No critical ground is assigned for this dictum, thus baldly put forth ; it is simply Dr. Weiss's habitual method of setting aside as unhistorical whatever does not approve itself to his sense of fitness. To act thus is to record the life of Christ himself, instead of allowing the Evangelists to have recorded it. That semi-Arian leaning which may be discerned in such an observation is still more evident in the remarks upon the Raising of Lazarus, where the writer observes : 'As formerly at the Marriage of Cana (John ii. 3 f.) Jesus saw in this request a sign that God would manifest His glory in Him ; *whether it was to be by a miraculous act of healing, or by the raising of the dead to life, He did not know.*' [The italics are ours.] This statement is clearly disproved, we may note, by S. John xi. 11. But the following sentence appears to us altogether unwarrantable as an argument. '*One thing only He was sure of,* it could not be the intention of God that Lazarus should die, for He would never refuse His mighty aid to the faith of the sisters, and He sent them a message to this effect' (p. 204). After all this we cannot be surprised that he, however strangely, observes : 'If, in the counsel of God, Lazarus was to be called back to life, it is self-evident here, as in all cases, that the separation of soul from body had not yet taken place, and therefore the latter could not fall a victim to decay.' But in 'the separation of soul and body' consists the fact of death ; and if this had not taken place Lazarus *was not dead*, and therefore could not have been raised from the dead. The writer therefore completely destroys the miracle in favour of which he professes, in some sense, to be arguing. But, in fact, his language here, as in so many other instances, is altogether inconsistent and illogical. He knocks down the theories of others, but it is only to build up another of his own, not altogether dissimilar to them. Here, for instance, at one moment he seems to uphold the 'historical truth' of the miracle, at the next he is arguing that the occurrence was 'completely isolated,' and 'naturally says nothing for

the power of Jesus over death' (p. 212). It is not pleasant to find him writing of 'the simulated tears' and 'simulated prayer of Jesus at the grave,' but this is probably to be regarded as an *argumentum ad hominem* as against Strauss. In fact, Dr. Weiss can be very severe on the rationalism of others; but his own arbitrary dealing with the letter of Scripture, rejection, dislocation, suppression, wholesale accusation of motive, is not in the least to be preferred. With what hardihood, again, he can assert that 'in John's Gospel there is no trace of such an absurdity as that this miracle played a part in the trial of Jesus,' &c. in the face of such statements as S. John xi. 46-53, xii. 10, 11, where the miracle is assigned as the real though unavowed motive for the trial and condemnation, on the part of the Scribes and Pharisees who brought it about, we can only wonder. We do not see any use in adducing other instances of similar dealing with the Gospel narrative. To reconstruct the life of our Lord upon a basis which, if not wholly naturalistic, evaporates the supernatural element, while retaining it in words, into such a thin *simulacrum* that it cannot be said any longer to form a part of the history, and leaves the Divine Nature of Jesus dwarfed and dwindled into the dimensions of a prophet or messenger, the Incommunicable Glory gone, the Brow

Naked and bare of its great diadem,

is not a process which will approve itself to the believer upon mature consideration; and for ourselves we must protest against it *in toto*, as we should think it would be the impulse of every reverent Christian and every thinker with a sufficient sense of his own fallibility to do.

The Bibliotheca Sacra. Edited by FREDERICK WRIGHT, JUDSON SMITH, and W. G. BALLANTINE. (Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.: E. J. Goodrich. London: Trübner.)

WE have before us the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, the numbers for July and October 1884 and those for January and April 1885. They form a well-selected miscellany of subjects, handled with various degrees of ability, but mostly above the average. The argument of Dr. Simon ('Christian Doctrine and Life,' p. 443) is a good example of deep and clear thought, showing how 'doctrine helps to make us free.' Perhaps the previous remark, 'Faith, being of the nature of feeling . . . is liable, as we all know, to change' (p. 442), requires qualification. 'Faith' seems to be a function of the whole man, not of any one department. Dr. Simon would, we think, have fortified his argument by clearly recognizing this. An historical review of the 'Hebrew Language' by Dr. R. Pick is of profound interest to the linguistic student, tracing the elements of decay imbibed at Babylon, and furthered by the much later decline of the study of the cognate Arabic and Syriac. A personal sketch of the leading Hebrew grammarians up to Kimchi, the source of all such tradition since, gives something of the relish of personal interest to a dry task. 'The Dialectic Method of Jesus' is the subject of a deeply moving

article by the Rev. R. Montague. After reviewing the narrative of the 'withered hand' he urges—

'Now the skill of this dialectic lies in the way in which Jesus throws the decision of their question on His critics, and avoiding all needless argument over which they might captiously haggle, and turning the lance of his elenchus on their consciences, probes their wicked, guilty spirit. In fact, this is the purpose, as we have seen, of all his dialectic with opponents. He seeks the inner man of the heart.'

This is verified by the previous analysis of the parable of the Good Samaritan and the Lord's dealing with the woman who 'loved much.'

A warm-hearted, enthusiastic answer to the theories of Kuenen, Colenso, Wellhausen, and others will be found in the 'Unity and Genuineness of Deuteronomy,' October 1884 number, p. 625 foll. The total absence of reference to Assyria and the strong Egyptian colouring which pervades that Book are specially urged with clearness and vigour. The same number continues a series of 'Sketches of Pentateuch Criticism' from Simon and Astruc downwards, further continued in the April 1885 number, which latter contains the 'Defenders of the Mosaic Authorship.' The most considerable of strictly theological articles in these four numbers is that on the 'Nicene Doctrine of the Homousion,' Oct. 1884, p. 698 foll. The writer's main point 'is that Athanasius not only did not regard the term as necessarily indicating numerical oneness, but that he used it as appropriately designating homogeneity—specific oneness.' It seems to us that some of the language quoted from Athanasius on p. 719 is more consistent with numerical than merely specific oneness: e.g. 'As to this (the substance of the Father) again, if it be other than the substance of the Son, an equal extravagance will meet us, there being in that case something between this that is from the Father and the substance of the Son, whatever that be.' He clearly means here that it is *not* 'other than the substance,' &c. But to predicate that A is 'not other' than B is to assert identity, i.e. 'numerical oneness' of A with B. In the third paragraph below again we read, 'The Word, being Son of the One God, is referred (*ἀναφέρεται*) to Him of whom also He is; so that the Father and the Son are two; yet the Unity (*Μονάς*=Monad) of the Godhead (Divinity) is indivisible and inseparable.' Surely *μονάς* is a word which postulates 'numerical oneness,' if the Greek language contains such. It is probable that Athanasius' language is not everywhere consistent with this view, and the writer (Dr. Craven) remarks elsewhere that the distinction of *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* appears to be post-Athanasian. Yet Athanasius must have answered, if the question had been pressed, that 'the Father and the Son were' not 'two' in the same respect as they were 'one,' and would presumably have made the distinction clear by employing such terms as *ὑπόστασις* and *οὐσία*. Again, on p. 745 (middle) a quotation from the 'Oxford Translation' of Athanasius reads, 'If the Son be other, as an Offspring, still He is the same (*ἑαυτὸν*) as God; and He and the Father are one in

propriety and peculiarity (οικειότητα) of nature, and the identity of the one Godhead.' Here the words 'same as God' and 'identity of the one Godhead' seem to postulate that 'numerical oneness' of nature which was afterwards distinctly asserted, while the words 'other, as an Offspring' point to what was later explicitly stated as distinctness of Persons. A well-written paper on a point of Greek grammar, 'Predicative Participles with Verbs in the Aorist,' is contributed by Professor Ballantine. He distinguishes (1) distinct but synchronous actions expressed by the pres. particip., ἦλθε βλέπων; (2) prior action expressed by the aor. particip., γαμήσας ἐτελεύτησε; (3) an additional assertion made concerning the same act expressed by the aor. particip. also, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, κατήγγησαν ἀσπασάμενοι, ἔφθη ἐλθών. We think the simpler statement for (3) would be where the connection between the two (verb and particip.) is logical. In (1) and (2) they are physically connected only. This logical connection may be one of condition, cause, effect, mode, &c.

The January 1885 number has a vigorous sketch of the rise and progress of Mormonism, but fails to notice what seems its most noteworthy item viewed as claiming revelation; to wit, that the 'Book of Mormon' was launched at first as a work of fiction—a religious novel, in short. Cumbrous, stupid, and unimaginative, in this projection it was a dead failure. Brought out on the *ipse dixit* of Joe Smith as a revelation, it became a vast success. The mixture of greed, chicane, unscrupulous violence, and astounding impudence, with a gospel of hard cash and broad acres, is, however, well exhibited. Full of most thrilling and instructive facts is 'The Moral Condition of Germany,' in which, counting from the year 1876 onwards, a return towards the higher and more spiritual elements of humanity seems recognizable in German society. At that precise time 'the eminent economist and liberal Schulze-Delitzsch said, "Any man who is not in the deepest valley of ignorance of German affairs will admit that the whole social and moral condition of things has reached a point where they threaten to dash into the abyss of ruin."'" The review, however, is in many respects extended to various European countries (to all, we think, these islands included, except Spain and Turkey, where probably no available materials exist), and to New York and other States of the Union. We learn that

'Britain and America have the sad pre-eminence of leading the world in drunkenness, though showing many signs of improvement. But while Britain, as a whole, seems improving, those that do drink seem to be getting worse. . . . As a rule the married of both sexes are less criminal than the unmarried; but in Germany especially crime among the married is on the increase . . . a most noteworthy index of the depravity of the German home, at least in the great cities. . . . Approaching Germany from any direction we are struck by an increasing number of suicides; and entering the empire, our way towards Saxony, its heart and centre, shows the same dark growth of self-murder, until in cities like Leipsic and Dresden we find ourselves upon the very mountain peaks of death from despair.'

Then follows a graduated table showing the annual (1874-8) rate of suicide per million in eleven nationalities—from Ireland, where it was

17, to Saxony, where it was 338, and in the last census rose to 408. As illustrating the domestic disorganization whence this proceeds, we read that 'while in Saxony "separated" men and women form 2.6 per million of the people, they contribute 12 per million to suicides.' The record threads the whole maze of social enormities, leaving not the foulest corner apparently unvisited, and makes an appalling tale. It shows the 'solidarity of crime,' each vice the seed plot of a darker one, each coil of the whole vortex opening tributary sink-holes of allied iniquity—'a logic of death which runs in awful sequence.' London is said to have over 5,000 infamous houses, containing 30,000 inmates, besides 40,000 sisters of shame 'who live alone.' As regards divorce, the statistics of unhappiness tend to mount up. 'In 1867 there were in Berlin 1,127 "separated" men and 2,464 "separated" women; in 1880 the number had more than doubled.' But

'Germany is not so bad as Switzerland, where liberty has run into license, until 5 per cent. of marriages are followed by divorce. . . . Massachusetts between 1860 and 1878 raised divorces from one in fifty-one marriages to one in twenty-one. . . . It is just the educated classes that stand lowest in their regard for the sacredness of marriage. Artists and literary men form 2 per cent. of the marriages, but apply for 3 per cent. of the divorces. In France it is still worse, for while the marriages of men in the liberal professions there make 2.4 per cent. their divorces exceed 23 per cent.'

The following seems to embody the moral of this dismal story :

'A general and especially a rapid rise in popular education, secular only, is followed uniformly by a rise in crime, especially crime against morals, seen in infanticide, female criminals, prostitutes, and bastards; also a great addition to cases of suicide and insanity. . . . Cities are the best educated, yet criminally worst.'

In the 'Attitude of Historic Creeds towards Heresy' we could wish one point, that of the appended anathema, referred to cursorily on p. 133, had been more directly dealt with. But when we read on p. 127, 'The *Quicumque* closes the series of ecumenical creeds,' we are startled that a writer of so much accomplished learning should even for a moment forget that the *Quicumque*, having been always rejected by the Greek Church, cannot claim that title. The pre-eminent work of the Nicene fathers receives a just tribute of admiration for its careful wisdom. Perhaps the treatment of the whole question of *credenda* rests too much on the relation of man to man, and would be more firmly based on the conditions of man's relation to God, and on the duty of a *depositum* committed by God to man. 'A Plea for a Liberal Education' does not seem to grasp the vital point. You cannot teach everything in the brief years of school-boy life. What, then, are the master keys that unlock the greatest number of minds? Surely language and number. Of language the fittest teaching instrument is the one which is most transparent to the laws of thoughts. This a feebly inflected language never is; and a highly composite language, like ours, is burdened with tremendous difficulties. Reform English spelling before English is thought of as

adequate. German is to Greek for teaching purposes as the blunderbuss is to the needle-gun. There is, by the way, a thoughtful but rather too discursive essay on 'Reforming our English' (p. 761 foll.), and one yet more valuable, 'Greek among Required Studies,' April 1885 number, p. 327 foll., which ably points out the claims of the most perfect instrument of human thought which the world has yet known, and forms, in fact, a reply to the *Plea* aforesaid.

The article (April 1885, p. 201) on 'Creation,' by Professor Dana, is excellent of its kind, bringing the cosmogony of Genesis into a synopsis with the facts deducible from scientific observation. It is well noticed that 'the Hebrew word *bārā*, translated *created*,' occurs 'on three occasions, and three only, in the chapter (Gen. i.)—the first at the creation of matter, the second at the creation of animal life, and the third at the creation of Man.'

Useful articles on kindred subjects are 'Science not Supreme' and a review of Mr. Drummond's 'Natural Law in the Spiritual World,' in which latter the non-consistency in that author's view of the word 'Life' is pointed out.

'He admits that, as to the phenomena, "all that is really possible is an analogy"; e.g. the fact that religious activity (in distinction from mere psychical activity) can be produced only by the Spirit of God is analogous to the fact that vegetable life can proceed only from vegetable life. . . . How, then, does this mere analogy between different realms, in which the word "life" has entirely different meanings, establish one continuous law, and this a physical one?'

The notices of recent publications, American of course predominating, have all the features of a thorough and careful estimate of the works included, together with a judicious selection of them.

Theologische Literaturzeitung for 1885. Nos. 1-13, January to June. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.)

THIS valuable periodical, modest and unpretending though it be, has this year had the honour of being noticed in many English publications, including the *Times* newspaper, because of an article (columns 277-281) by Harnack on the now famous Fayoum fragment of papyrus. The article is a review of Bickell's *Ein Papyrusfragment eines nichtkanonischen Evangeliums* (Innsbruck, 1885), and is most interesting and instructive, although we may not be able to accept all its conclusions. The Innsbruck professor's own views are not made more attractive to us by the arbitrary manner in which he has dealt with Old Testament texts. His new book on Ecclesiastes, entitled, *Der Prediger über den Wert des Daseins* (Innsbruck: Wagner), is carefully examined (57-62) by Budde, and shown to be very suggestive, but full of wild improbabilities. The fact that we are largely indebted to German scholarship in theology generally and in Biblical exegesis specially is probably recognized by all our divines, but the extent to which our recent Biblical revision has been influenced by similar work done in Germany is, we think, unsuspected by most Englishmen and fully known to very few. Those who take an interest

in the subject should by all means read Kautzsch's review (83-91) of the so-called *Probibibel* (Halle, 1883), his sole contribution to this periodical during the half-year, and written (as he tells us in col. 85) somewhat unwillingly at the repeated solicitation of the editors. Therein may be learnt how completely analogous to the history and character of the Revision of our Authorized Version have been the history and character of the Revision of Luther's Translation; and every reader will be convinced that for a proper appreciation of our Revised Bible of 1885, and for a probable solution of some of the mysteries connected therewith, it is almost indispensable to have an acquaintance with the *Probibibel* of 1883, if not also with the reports of the work of the German Committee of Revisers, compiled by Dr. Frick and Dr. Schröder. Kautzsch fully expresses his gratitude and admiration for the *Probibibel* as a step in the right direction, but considers the work marred throughout by two fundamental errors—(1) estimating Luther's translation more highly than the original Word of God; and (2) the inconsistency, caprice, and lack of thoroughness that seem inseparable from committee-work, in which no amendment is effected unless it is approved by two-thirds of the members. In a Dutch book, reviewed (1-4) by von Gebhardt—de Koe's *De Conjecturaal-critiek en het Evangelie naar Johannes* (Utrecht: Kemink)—conjectural emendations of 171 places in S. John's Gospel are put forward and discussed, but the author feels confident with regard to three of them only. Nowack, on Dr. Cheyne's *Translation of the Psalms* (London: Paul), observes that the translator possesses exceptionally high qualifications for such difficult work. Stade sympathetically recommends Robertson Smith's *Prophets of Israel* (Edinburgh: Black), and thinks a book of the same kind written for the benefit of Germans would not be superfluous. Kolde gives a brief but clear account of Archbishop Hamilton and his Catechism, that strange compound of sound doctrine and papal error; Mr. Law's excellent glossary to the Clarendon Press reprint is gratefully appreciated, whereas an opinion expressed by the ex-Premier, Mr. Gladstone, in his 'herzlich unbedeutend' preface to the same is shown to be probably erroneous. Charles Kingsley's *Village Sermons* have recently been translated into German (Gotha: Perthes), but Hartung advises his fellow-countrymen to read the simple English original in preference to the fairly executed, but not un mutilated, version. We are delighted to learn (25-28) that a descriptive catalogue of the Greek manuscripts in the libraries of the Levant has been commenced under the auspices of the Greek Philological Society of Constantinople. It is to be entitled, *Μαυρογυρδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη*, because a gentleman named Theodor A. Maurogordatos has given 600 Turkish pounds (about 550*l.* sterling) towards defraying the cost of it: the first part was published last year by Lorentz and Keil, Constantinople. We mentioned six months ago that Dr. J. Müller, imperial librarian at Berlin, was to succeed Dr. C. R. Gregory in supplying the bibliography for the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. The thoroughness with which he has fulfilled this duty may be inferred from the fact that in the papers before us he has filled 54 out of the 320 columns with his lists.

Several good articles treating of ecclesiastical history, dogmatics, religious philosophy, biography, Lutheranism, and art, we have not space even to name; one (238-242) on the 'Salvation Army,' being a review by F. R. Fay of Prof. Kolde's *Die Heilsarmee* (Erlangen: Deichert), would bear translation into English.

Church Plate in the Archdeaconry of Worcester. By WILLIAM LEA, M.A., Archdeacon of Worcester. (Worcester: Deighton and Co. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1884.)

A LARGE part of this book is only of local interest and value: for it contains a complete enumeration of all the sacred vessels in use in every church throughout the Archdeaconry, whether they be good, bad, or indifferent, silver, plated, or pewter. But the Introduction, and many of the Archdeacon's notes and conjectures in the course of his catalogue, are very valuable and suggestive; and, moreover, the example set by his work should be known, followed, and fruitful. On these two aspects of the book a few words may be said.

In the Introduction, Archdeacon Lea gathers up the results of his careful and complete investigation, and draws from it certain general principles in regard to the history and character of the Eucharistic vessels in the representative field which he has explored. It is pathetic to find how thoroughly the unhappy orders for the alteration of the old chalices were carried into effect, so that out of all that had been hallowed in the worship of our fathers 'not more than six or eight pre-Reformation vessels are known to remain.' Only two appear in Archdeacon Lea's treatise—the paten found in the stone coffin of Walter de Cantelupe, Bishop of Worcester, 1236, and the paten of St. Michael's, at Cofton Hackett: for the Archdeacon is prudently tentative about the stem of the Overbury chalice, qualifying with a 'possibly' the opinion of certain archæologists, who think that the Elizabethan cup was added to the mediæval stem. Since the beginning of that reformation which thus destroyed or disfigured all but a few traces of the wealth and art dedicated to the service of the Holy Eucharist there have been four periods of marked and peculiar generosity in this matter. The first falls within the reign of Elizabeth, but it contains one year of most remarkable profuseness. In the Archdeaconry of Worcester alone there are eighty-four chalices of the year 1571. Nearly all these are of the same pattern, and are decorated with a similar band of floral ornament, though they vary widely in size; and it is certainly strange that though chalices with the same pattern, ornament, and Hall-mark, are found in every part of England, yet, 'notwithstanding this uniformity, no order for their pattern has ever been discovered.' It would be interesting to know whether the historians of the period can give any conclusive account of this widespread, simultaneous, and uniform production of Eucharistic plate, for the matter cannot be regarded as closed by Archdeacon Lea's conjecture, ingenious as it is:—

'It was early in 1571 that the Queen was formally excommunicated by Pope Pius V. In March, that year, one Felton affixed the Bull, which

professed to deprive her of all title to the crown, and to absolve her subjects from their allegiance, to the gates of the Bishop of London's Palace. Might not this great issue of cups in that year, and the inscription of 1571 upon them, have some connection with this? It might be looked upon as a practical answer to the Pope's Bull; and, looking at it from this point of view, it will throw light on the inscription on the cover paten of the loyal parish of Ilmington, "1571, God save the Quene."¹

The strong *a priori* probability that this sudden appearance of so many chalices in the same year was due to the issuing of some decisive edict from high authority is confirmed by the tradition which the Archdeacon has found in rural districts both in Worcestershire and Warwickshire, where this chalice is known as the 'Five Pound Cup,' and it is said that that sum was granted to the poorer parishes for its purchase.

The destruction and spoliation of the period of the Commonwealth will account for the second access of generosity, and for the large amount of eucharistic vessels connected with the date of the Restoration. Especially 'the many massive flagons of this date,' says Archdeacon Lea, 'might have been thank-offerings from Royalist gentry, who wished to give to God of their best, "forasmuch as the King is come again in peace unto his own."' But it is harder to find a reason for the liberality which characterized, at all events throughout the field covered by this book, the first half of the eighteenth century. During the episcopate of Bishop Hough (1717-1743), 'more than thirty handsome articles of plate (often flagons weighing from seventy to eighty ounces each) were given to churches in the archdeaconry' of Worcester. It would be interesting to know whether this generosity of dedication prevailed throughout England, and whether any account more satisfactory than a conjecture can be given of its reason.

The fourth period of munificence in the provision of the sacred vessels is that of the present day, and has resulted from the revival of life and of affection in the English Church of the last half century. With the astonishing activity of church building and restoration and adornment there has naturally been a fresh glow of zeal for the honour and for the less unworthy circumstance of Eucharistic worship. In many cases this zeal has been guided by discretion; and the 'modern mediæval pattern' as it stands side by side with the Puritan, the Georgian, or the Elizabethan, certainly has an indisputable advantage of intrinsic beauty, historical significance, and ritual propriety. And in some cases the offerings of this day have been really noble works, not unfit to be compared with the splendour that we have lost by the cruelty or timidity of the Reformation. But there is a certain sadness in thinking of the necessity of the warning which the Archdeacon gives, and which we would heartily endorse:—

'Unfortunately, from my point of view, the art of silver-plating has of late years been carried to a high point of excellence, and, in consequence of the comparative cheapness of plated ware, many of these new churches

¹ Introduction, p. 14.

have been provided with vessels of this description. Doubtless, when money is an object it is tempting to be able to provide a set of vessels of good design for the price of one article of real metal ; but if this difficulty should ever occur, I would venture to suggest that the cup and paten, at any rate, should always be of real metal, and that a flagon of glass or pewter should be provided until there is an opportunity of providing a more worthy one.¹

We have indicated some of the sources of interest which the Archdeacon's book may afford to general readers. It may suggest a new subject for inquiry, and observation, and comparison, and recording, upon visits to churches ancient and modern ; it may strengthen another link between general history and the history of the English Church ; it may tend to teach a more thoughtful and appreciative reverence for the sacred vessels. But it surely has a still greater value in the example which it sets to those who are in positions similar to its venerable author. If more archdeacons would follow the example of Archdeacon Lea's care for the eucharistic vessels under his charge (even if they cannot set an example like that of his liberality), they would do much to encourage the zeal and devotion both of clergy and laity in this regard. They would give a final blow to the careless or niggardly spirit which until lately allowed many chalices and patens to be melted down or sold when it was desired to provide money for other purposes or more convenient vessels for the service of the altar ; so that no more silver which had been consecrated to the service of the Holy Mysteries, and from which the faithful of many generations had received the Body and Blood of their Lord should pass into the shop-windows of jewellers or curiosity dealers, to be 'collected' with no deeper interest or higher honour than old china or snuff-boxes. And, as the care for the 'supellex Christi' occupied its due place among the archidiaconal functions, those dignitaries would recede further and further from the position of which it used to be said that it combined the title of a Deacon, the orders of a Priest, and the assumption of a Bishop, approaching much more closely to the imitation of the Archdeacon and Saint; Laurence, who

'Claustis sacrorum præerat,
Cælestis arcanum domus
Fidis gubernans clavibus
Votasque dispensans opes.'¹

Oplysninger om Forholdet mellem Struensee og det danske Kancelli.
Af L. KOCH. *Historisk Tidsskrift.* Vol. IV. Pt. II. pp. 287-301. (Kjobenhavn, 1883.)

THIS is not the place for many words or long paragraphs on the young and handsome royal pair, King Christian VII. of Denmark-Norway, and his wife, Caroline Matilda of England. He was born in 1749, began to reign in 1766, and died in 1808. His unhappy consort saw day in 1751, and expired in 1775, an outcast prisoner at Celle, in Hanover, not yet twenty-four years old, protesting her

¹ *Aurelii Prudentii Hymnus de Martyrio Sancti Laurentii.*

innocence to the last. Nor is it necessary to fill pages about Count J. Fr. Struensee, a German doctor and adventurer, who became Prime Minister, or rather Grand Vizier, of Denmark-Norway, lands nominally under the sceptre of Christian VII.

Struensee was a gifted man, but demoralized by the dissolving philosophy and base ideas of the period. Specially was he given to making rapid changes—some of them useful, most of them disastrous—in every department of State and Church. A good father's atheistical and excessively debauched son, he corrupted and ruined the young king body and soul, and then used his master's name as a mere stalking-horse for his own ends. Armed with the half-idiotic king's name-stamp, he mechanically added to his own 'enactments' the all-powerful signature, was *Major-domo* of the palace, and overbore all law and right at pleasure, till the court reaction broke out in blood, and the scaffold swept him away, unhappily dragging with him the helpless English-born queen.

What concerns us here is only one episode in Struensee's career—his changes in the ancient Christian wedlock-code of Denmark-Norway. But hereby, through the poison of bad example, he largely relaxed the popular marriage laws of other countries also. The materials for this sketch have only lately been made accessible in a well-written and interesting paper by a Danish clergyman, L. Koch, in the volume of which the title is prefixed to this paper.

It is from September 1770, after the excellent Bernstorff's fall, to the end of 1771, that Struensee becomes active and imperious. By degrees his governmental decrees become mere acts of momentary caprice, lacked by supreme contempt of the National Code actually in force. He drives his will through with relentless iron nonchalance, treating all the official legal authorities as schoolboys and registration clerks. That his absolute 'Cabinet orders' were also insolent in tone and mostly in the German language, is characteristic of the man. But let us come to the pages where Herr Koch shows how, by a mere stroke of Struensee's pen—the *Papal* pen of a godless Protestant debauchee—marriage with a deceased wife's sister became a fixed common law instead of a very rare accidental dispensation.

At p. 290 we read :—

'What caused the first clash between the Chancery and the new ruler seems to have been a petition from a dean's wife, named Chrystalsin, begging that her daughter might espouse a priest, one P. Gutfeld, who had before had in wedlock an elder daughter. This document was sent to the king, and when it reached the Chancery bore the word "Approved." The Chancery at once, under date Nov. 23, 1770, issued the permission, and forwarded it for His Majesty's signature. But that court added the remark, that the year before, with regard to a similar application, they had procured the opinions of the theological and juridical faculties, both which had dissuaded from any such grants. Partly, they looked on them as offensive to the common people, "who usually in their ideas follow the law, which punishes with death those who in this way commit fornication." Partly, also, they thought it would give rise to jealousy and the destruction of right feeling and hearty confidence between wedded folk and brothers and sisters, if a man could hope for legal union with his wife's

sister, who usually was living in his house. In fact the king had before (June 2 and October 12, in the year 1769) twice refused any such license. Finally they add: "And now also the Chancery must propose a similar negative to the petition of the said Madam Chrystalsin." This remonstrance was returned with the following footnote: "In this instance the accorded dispensation shall hold good. Can the ordinance on this head not be altogether abolished, as there is nothing in holy writ which forbids such connexions, and marriage must be made as easy as possible?" The Chancery replied, that as the faculties had thought it was not contrary to holy writ to allow such unions, but had only brought various political reasons against it, "it will depend on your Majesty's gracious pleasure how far, and whether, a dispensation can be granted for the like marriages whenever permission is asked. In this case they might be treated in the same way as petitions with regard to other marriages forbidden by the law, such, for instance, as to first and second cousins, for which dispensations are daily issued."

'But this attempt to persuade the king (= Struensee) to abandon the general ordinance, and be content with dispensations in each particular case, did not succeed. He (Struensee) wrote on the document: "To marry a wife's sister, or a first or second cousin, shall once for all be allowed to everyone, without asking for any dispensation, and this shall be communicated to the German Chancery, that it also may publish a similar ordinance on this head. Ch. (= Christian Rex)."

'In accordance herewith was issued a declaration, dated December 27, 1770. This was enlarged still more the following year, when an ordinance (April 3, 1771) permits all unions between kinsfolk, in so far as not forbidden in holy writ. This also was an act caused by a passing event. A man sought leave to marry his wife's step-daughter, who was pregnant by him. The Chancery probably saw how useless it would be to advise any refusal, and proposed to give permission, "yet without any binding consequence for the future, the law forbidding it as offensive to decency, and there being very few instances in which it has hitherto been allowed." But on the document is written: "Granted, and it can be generally permitted, as it is not contrary to divine law" (February 8, 1771).'

Thus the advocates for changing the marriage laws of Christian England can see, as in a glass, who it was that brought about this social degradation in Denmark-Norway, and indirectly elsewhere. How it has worked there, and what other 'degrees' it has undermined, we all know.

NEW EDITIONS, SERMONS, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

MR. DE ROMESTIN has done good service in editing *Certain Smaller Treatises of S. Augustine* (Parker), originally published in 1848 by Charles Marriott. The treatise *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos* is omitted, but we note the important addition of the 'Enchiridion to Laurentius,' or 'Concerning Faith, Hope, and Charity.'

Under the King's Banner (Wells Gardner and Co.), by C. A. Johns, is a series of well-told stories of the soldiers of Christ in all ages. It would be an excellent present for a child, and could not fail to bring home to an intelligent reader a living sense of the continuity of the Church. The illustrations, few in number, are so feebly designed that they would be better away. Messrs. Wells Gardner and Co. continue their useful series of children's books and other

serials, notably the *Grain of Mustard Seed*, the only organ of the Ladies' Association for the Promotion of Female Education among the Heathen in connexion with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

Besides Mr. Moore's admirable and unanswerable tractate, *The Case for Establishment Stated*, which ought to be circulated by thousands, the S. P. C. K. has published a telling tract, in large print, by the Rev. J. T. Lockwood, entitled *Hear the Other Side: a Word about Disestablishment and Endowment*.

Theosophy, Religion, and Occult Science (Redway), by H. S. Olcott, is happily so dull and feeble that it can do none of the mischief which it was meant to do. *The Autobiography of an Alms-bag* (Hodges) is not even funny. It is a dismal collection of worn-out anecdotes and gossip about Church and Churchmen. *The Diary of an Actress* (Griffith), with an Introduction by the Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth, may attract readers in search of the sensational. In reality it is nothing but a monotonous record of loneliness and misery and disappointment in a most dangerous career. The writer seems to have avoided, though not without difficulty, the worst perils of her profession. And her story is a warning against those of either sex who, through vanity and self-will, and a ridiculous idea that they are following an artistic instinct, abandon higher duties for 'the stage.'

Family Prayers for a Week. Compiled by William Bright, D.D. (Parker, 1885). Those who have used Dr. Bright's *Private Prayers for a Week* will value this further compilation. It has just the same merits: manliness, simplicity, a correct theology (so often wanting in Prayers), and, above all, a wealth of terse and most precious collects from ancient sources.